DRURY COLLEGE LIBRARY
Springfield, Missouri
Periodical
Ou8
27923
29

The Outlook

JANUARY 4, 1913

LYMAN ABBOTT, Editor-in-Chief HAMILTON W. MABIE, Associate Editor
THEODORE ROOSEVELT
Contributing Editor

A Saner Merry Christmas

If anybody in the world thinks that Christmas as a festival is diminishing in interest, he has only to look at the newspapers published the morning after Christmas and add to the record of fun and joy and generosity there indicated the measureless amount of personal happiness of the non-newspaper kind. In fact, last week there were many striking and unusual manifestations of the Christmas spirit as felt outside intimate circles. Foremost among these, of course, comes the New York Christmas tree. This beautiful idea and its execution are due to a New York woman who modestly kept in the background. She had the happy thought of giving the whole city a Christmas tree, and it stands this week in Madison Square lighted with unnumbered colored electric bulbs at night. It is to be made again on New Year's Eve the center of such a celebration as took place on Christmas Eve, when the chiming of bells, the glittering of the lights among the snow-laden boughs, and music from an orchestra and voluntary societies of singers, made the event notable and literally unique in the city's history. New York has the credit of introducing this charming Christmas feature; but one or two other American cities "caught on," as the slang phrase goes, and had their Christmas tree too this year; while next year it is safe to say that New York's example will be followed in scores of cities. On New Year's Eve the tree will be a prime factor in the sane and sober New Year's Eve celebration which Mr. Jacob A. Riis has urged so forcibly and, we hope, successfully. Indeed, we are told that the Christmas tree idea started in an informal out-of-doors celebration at Mr. Riis's home, Richmond Hill, last year. Other noteworthy incidents of Christmas time, apart from the usual services and the dinners and presents made by associations and individuals to thousands of the poor, were such as these: Columbia University had an old-fashioned Yuletide festival, with the yule log and all as in the ancient days; in Indianapolis a singular festivity was held in the court where forty men were being tried in connection with the dynamite plot—the jurymen woke up Christmas day to find a Christmas tree for each of them beside their beds in the Federal court-house, and in the court-room there was a Christmas tree for the prisoners hung with oranges and candy, while the alleged dynamiters wore sprigs of holly, and some of their children were present, the press despatches say, trundling their toys in court; in Atlanta, instead of a saner Christmas, there was something more like an old-fashioned Fourth of July, if we believe a newspaper statement that more than two hundred patients—shot, cut, bruised, burned, and injured otherwise—were received at the hospitals as a result of the celebration of Christmas with fireworks, pistols, and other noise-making devices; in Berlin over 600,000 Christmas trees were sold, or one tree to every five persons in the city, which would seem to mean almost one tree for every single family; but Germany should certainly have a "Merry Christmas" when it is considered that over $16,000,000 worth of toys were exported last year from that country. Still another Christmas idea, which is new to us, although it has apparently been in operation for some time, is the establishment by some banks of Christmas savings clubs on a plan which induces people to pay in a certain sum, agreed upon, every week in the year, so as to have a fund ready for the next Christmas—say five cents for the first week, ten cents for the second, and so on, increasingly; that rate would yield a Christmas fund of $63.75, with perhaps interest added; or, if the plan is reversed, one may pay $2.50 the first week, and reduce the payment by five cents each succeeding week, with the same result. It is stated in newspaper reports that over eight hundred banks conducted Christmas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

savings clubs of this kind last year, and that one company paid out, not long before Christmas time, the great sum of $350,000 on this account. Altogether 1912 had about as good a Christmas as one could easily imagine.

The "Money Trust" Investigation

The Congressional Committee—sometimes known as the Pujo Committee, because Congressman Pujo is its Chairman—which is investigating the so-called "money trust," has, we think, clearly accomplished more than the public thought it would when it began its work. There was a very widespread popular impression at the beginning of the investigation that the Committee was created primarily for sensational political purposes. Unjust as this impression may have been, it was not wholly unnatural. Too often in the past, especially during heated political campaigns, Congressional committees have been appointed and have conducted themselves in partisan fashion. The deliberations of such committees have too often been the "yellow journalism" of Congress. The temptation to conduct the public cross-examination of rich men along the lines of yellow journalism is perhaps a natural one. The public certainly expected something of this kind from the "money trust" investigation. But it is only fair to say that the Committee, while some of its hearings have undoubtedly been sensational and political, has made public some facts, resting on the best evidence, regarding American finance and financiers which must inevitably be of great social, economic, and legislative value in the future. The particular facts to which we refer are those concerning the system of "interlocking directorates," by means of which a very small body of men control great chains of banking corporations, which in turn control almost fabulous sums of cash deposits, securities, and other forms of capital. "Interlocking directorates" consist of men almost every one of whom is an influential member of the boards of a dozen or two dozen or perhaps more banks, trust companies, insurance companies, railway companies, and other financial institutions. Expert testimony was presented to the Committee showing that by this method of control by boards of directors a group of twenty-five or thirty great financiers have at their command twenty-five billion dollars of capital. This sum is so vast that the mind can scarcely form any intelligible idea of it. The National debt of the United States used to be not many years ago the gigantic figure which was used as a standard for measuring the enormous accumulation of capital; but the debt of the United States is only a little over one billion dollars. What Mr. Pujo's Committee calls the "money trust" controls a volume of wealth twenty-five times as great as the National debt. Such statements are neither sensational nor demagogic. They are justified by the testimony of so great an authority as Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan. What is demagogic and sensational is to say that the thirty men who are the recognized managers of the "money trust" are robber barons and enemies of society. The fact is that all of them are very hard workers and that most of them, while they take good care that they are well paid for their personal services, are working in accordance with what they believe to be principles of justice and sound social economy for the benefit of society. In the case of the "money trust" it is not the individuals who need to be reformed by the Legislature, but the system. Mr. Morgan's own testimony before the Committee, we think, clearly shows that.

Mr. Morgan's Testimony

By common consent Mr. Morgan is not only the dean of American financiers, but in intellectual ability and force of character the greatest figure in American finance. It would hardly be too much to say that as an individual he is the greatest living figure in the entire financial world. We do not say that he is one of the great financial theorists of modern times, or that he would have been a Turgot in France, a Gladstone in England, or a Chase in the United States, if his tastes and career had taken him into administrative politics. But he is unquestionably a leader of men, and his own fortune and the success of the great enterprises with which he has been connected have been built upon this quality of leadership. His financial rectitude and honor have never been questioned in the slightest degree. Mr. Morgan's firm is a private banking firm, and yet he stated that his firm has at the present time on deposit over one hundred million dollars from both individuals and corporation depositors. These deposits are not secured, as in the case of National or State banks, by Govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment-inspected reserves; they rest solely in a personal trust and confidence in Mr. Morgan and his partners. Such reputation is certainly better than great riches, and we have no doubt that Mr. Morgan cherishes it as his most highly prized possession. It is this confidence in Mr. Morgan that gives his testimony before the Pujo Committee special interest and significance. He frankly admitted that this power in the world of finance is much the same as we have described it in the foregoing paragraph. For example, in his cross-examination he frankly said that in organizing the United States Steel Corporation, or the so-called "Steel Trust," the Board of Directors was chosen subject to his personal approval. Financial power, he believes, has to be exercised by a small group of men. He is convinced that combination, or, as he preferred to call it, "co-operation," is the only method by which great financial enterprises can be carried on; but that this financial power is primarily exercised for the good of society and of the country; that bad men could not exercise it; that such men could not attain the power; or, if they did attain it, acts of injustice or of greed on their part would at once deprive them of it. Mr. Morgan testified that character is one of the essential elements of financial success, and that he himself would prefer to lend a million dollars to a man with character and without securities than to a man with securities and without character. His view is that the present concentration of power in American finance is due to natural laws and will be properly regulated by natural laws. We both agree with Mr. Morgan and disagree with him. We believe with him that combination in industry is not only inevitable but desirable, that there should be concentration of administrative ability and responsibility. But we do not agree that it is sufficient to guard against the evils of greed, selfishness, and despotism by leaving everything to natural law. In political philosophy we surmise that Mr. Morgan would recommend a benevolent despotism. If a benevolent despotism could be made everlasting, we might agree with him; but the moment society admits the principle of benevolent despotism it admits also the principle of malevolent despotism. The men who wrecked the Erie Railroad forty years ago or brought on "Black Friday" were malevolent despots, and they were products of the same system that has, by a much happier turn of events, produced Mr. Morgan. What is needed in the financial world is that which is needed in the railway world and the industrial world—private efficiency, genius, and enterprise responsible to a superior authority, namely, the authority of the people exercised through Government. Nothing has made it clearer than Mr. Morgan's own testimony that some reform of our banking and financial laws is needed, and needed promptly.

MAR 3 '30

The Indictment of Mr. Mellen

The Federal Grand Jury has found a criminal indictment against Mr. Mellen, the President of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad, and Mr. Chamberlin, President of the Grand Trunk road. The charge is that these two gentlemen, acting on behalf of their great railway systems, have entered into a conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. As we understand it, the indictment is based upon practically one specific act, although it is undoubtedly the result of complaints, made for a long time and over a wide territory, that the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad Company exercises in New England a grasping monopoly of the transportation business. Some time ago the Grank Trunk Railway, a Canadian corporation with lines extending into the United States, began to build a branch of its main system to reach ultimately American tide-water at Providence, Rhode Island. It was alleged that the New Haven road resented this entrance into its territory and placed all sorts of difficulties in the way of the new enterprise of the Grand Trunk. Finally, according to the accusations upon which the indictment is based, the New Haven road, either by money payments or by threats or by agreement to make some kind of reimbursement, persuaded the Grand Trunk road to abandon the railway line to Providence, part of which had been constructed. Critics of the indictment assert that this is the first instance on record in which a railway has been proceeded against for refusing to carry out promises of competition against another railway. Of course, according to the old view that railways are private property, a railway owner has just as much right to stop building his railway as a factory owner has to stop building a factory if his capital gives out or if he changes his mind with regard to the prospective profits of the factory. But this view that railway

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

building is merely a form of private business is no longer generally entertained. Grants of land and of rights of way by the State make the State in a very real sense an important partner in all railway construction. In this case the State of Rhode Island thought it had what may be fairly called a contract with the Grand Trunk Railway. It believes that this contract has been broken by the Grand Trunk and the New Haven railways in a manner so noxious to public welfare that it may, when taken into consideration with other specific acts mentioned in the indictment, reasonably be called a conspiracy. At the same time that this indictment was found there was made public a report to President Taft by Mr. Luther Conant, Jr., Commissioner of Corporations, which gives facts and statistics corroborating to a large extent the complaint that the New Haven Railroad Company practically, if not nominally, controls the entire transportation system of New England, including the steam railways, the trolleys, and the shipping. If the indictment against the New Haven road in the person of Mr. Mellen is brought to trial, undoubtedly many things concerning the New Haven occupation of New England will be transferred from the realm of rumor into the realm of fact. Now that the matter has been carried to the courts, judgment with regard to specific acts ought not to be expressed in the newspapers and should await judicial procedure, but it seems to us perfectly clear that the present controversy between the New England States and the New Haven Railroad makes it manifest that State regulation of great industrial combinations is a failure. We think there must be and will be a steady trend towards Federal regulation. Moreover, if it is wrong for the New Haven Railroad to control the water transportation of Long Island Sound and of the Maine coast or of the suburban electric lines, there ought to be some authority which can tell the railway so before it buys its steamships and trolley lines. That authority, it seems to us, can be exercised efficiently only by the Federal Government.

Railway Accidents: Speed and Equipment

Recently emphasis has been added to the prevailing opinion concerning recent railway accidents. The highest authority competent to judge of the causes of those disasters, the Inter-State Commerce Commission, made its report. While the report does not touch the accidents which have occurred during the few months of the present fiscal year, it does review those of the fiscal year ending July 1 last. It finds that during that period on our railways over ten thousand persons were killed and nearly a hundred and seventy thousand injured. This is appalling. What were the causes of these accidents? One cause was excessive speed. Another was inferior equipment. Still another was inferior organization. As to speed and equipment, it should be clear to the veriest observer that most of our railways are not adapted to the high-speed trains which it is supposed the public wants. And it does want them. But it does not want them at the expense of safety. We have in mind a railway company which in other years paid a small, safe, secure dividend and spent the rest of its earnings on the road's betterment. Now, in order to please Wall Street, it pays twice as much dividend, thus exhausting the earnings which should be spent on its property. The result is that a poorly ballasted road remains poorly ballasted, that sharp curves have not been lengthened, that a single-track system has not been changed to the double-track made necessary by the traffic, that proper cautionary signals and safety devices have not been installed, that steel cars have not replaced the antiquated wooden coaches, and that, with all this, the patient patrons of the road, having paid a first-class fare for a first-class trip, find that their first-class fare has been accepted by a third-class road. The officers of that road would resent this appellation. Yet they insist, despite repeated accidents, in running their trains at a high speed. Of the over eighty-two hundred derailments reported to the Inter-State Commerce Commission during the year, almost a quarter were attributed to defects of roadway and nearly half to defects of equipment. Over one cause of accidents—namely, the hidden flaws contained in steel rails—the companies have little control. The best railway operators are working with the steel manufacturers so to improve the process of making rails as to remove this hidden danger. But accidents should not be attributed to this cause which have been shown to be due to rotten ties. The result of combining high speed and rotten roadway is indicated by such details from the Commission's report as the following:

In one serious derailment an examination of the track in the vicinity of the accident dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

closed 906 rotten ties within a distance of 147 rail lengths.

Under many of the rails there were as many as eleven bad ties, and under each of two rails there were twelve ties so badly decayed and broken as to be totally unfit for service.

In many of these ties the spikes were so loose that they were easily removed by hand, the wood having no longer any holding power. The track in the vicinity of this accident was poorly ballasted and was unsafe for the passage of trains at ordinary speed.

Railway Accidents: The Human Factor

Another cause of railway accidents is the human factor. The Commission's report justly declares, however, that railway employees are not wholly responsible. The great increase in the speed and weight of trains and the growth of traffic have put undue strain upon the men engaged in moving the trains. This increased burden on both men and equipment has not been offset by adequate regulations, discipline, and mechanical appliances. In a recent letter to the New York "Times" on this subject Mr. James O. Fagan, whose criticisms on railway management are always the result of personal experience, declares that the Commission itself should examine and license the employees who operate passenger trains. As the pilots of vessels are licensed, why should not we license the pilots of trains? And, in our opinion, they should be licensed for good behavior when off duty as well as on duty. No pilot is supposed to get drunk while off duty, nor should any trainman. In this connection we note that eight thousand employees of the Northeastern Railway of England recently struck to maintain their supposed right to get drunk when off duty. These men are misguided upholders of individualism, as the "Railway Gazette" forcibly argues, in a pursuit in which individualism has no claim as against the rights of the public to safety through total abstinence on the part of those intrusted with human lives. On the other hand, one of the grounds of the Southern Railway strike some years since was the opinion of the engineers that their own safety and the passengers' safety depended upon the acquaintance of an engineer with the route over which he took a train. But as the firemen were Negroes, the engineers could not acquire this knowledge of their routes by traveling over them as firemen. Thus labor associations have ranged themselves on both sides of this question of safety. But a higher authority may now have to take hold of the railway labor problem in its relation to preventable accidents, so that the reliable man's work will not be detracted from by the tragic inefficiency of the careless man's.

Railway Accidents: The Westport Wreck

The most numerous accidents on a single road since the close of the last fiscal year on any railway have been, we believe, those on the New York, New Haven, and Hartford system. The most serious of them occurred at Westport, Connecticut, last October. An engineer, though with five years of clear record behind him, passed signals and warnings and took a crossover at fifty miles an hour where his speed regulation called for fifteen miles. He lost his life and the lives of six others. The Public Utilities Commission of Connecticut investigated the causes of the disaster and ordered that all express trains shall come to a full stop at crossovers before the switch is changed for the detour of the train. This order is being complied with, we are glad to add; tower men have been instructed not to set switches for crossover movements until all crossover trains have been brought to a full stop. While we have here an example of a State commission and a railway company acting in harmony, it would be well if all State commissions had the jurisdiction over railway corporations enjoyed by the New York State Public Service Commission. In the matter of accident investigations the Commission's recommendations are not of themselves necessarily mandatory. Upon making such recommendations the Commission usually asks whether or not the company in question will comply therewith, or desires to be heard upon the points involved. If, after hearing the company, the Commission is of its original opinion and there is no concession on the part of the company, the Commission issues an order which is mandatory. In case of violation of this order the Legislature has granted authority to the Commission to commence an action for a penalty. In the opinion of the Connecticut Commission, the Westport wreck would not have occurred if the railway company had followed the recommendations of the Chief Inspector of Safety Appliances of the Inter-State Commerce Commission in its report on the similar accident to the Federal express at Bridgeport a year ago, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resulted in the death of fourteen persons and the injury of fifty-four. The Inter-State Commerce Commission's report concerning the Westport wreck is now at hand. It says: "To meet the requirements of a situation disclosed by the Bridgeport wreck, similar in all respects to the accident under consideration, no new devices have been installed or seriously investigated, nor have any attempts been made . . . even to experiment with devices intended for the purpose of meeting these emergencies." Perhaps the railway company agrees with Mr. Fagan's illogical criticism in his recent letter to the New York "Times:" "If we relieve the engineer from the duty of watching the signals, . . . we simply pass the responsibility along to the man whose duty it is to keep the automatic apparatus in order." At all events the railway company has now advertised a reward of ten thousand dollars to the inventor who shall first produce "an automatic device that will safely arrest an express steam locomotive that has passed danger signals." Unless we are mistaken, the New Haven road presents no insuperable difficulties to the installation of an adaptation of the Kinsman system, which for years has been in successful operation in the New York City subways and the Hudson Tunnels, bringing untold peace of mind to the millions of passengers who daily travel in safety therein.

Dr. Wiley's Successor

The President has recently exercised the appointing power of his office in filling posts which have very close connection with the life of the people. In appointing a successor to Dr. Harvey W. Wiley to head the Bureau of Chemistry the President had a peculiarly difficult problem. Dr. Wiley's services in the campaign of education which resulted in the enactment of the Pure Food Law, and no less his services in the enforcement of that law, are well known and almost universally recognized with gratitude. In the course of the performance of his duties he did not inspire gratitude in the minds of all, for there were many interests which were opposed to his activities. Moreover, Dr. Wiley, being a man of strong opinions, encountered strong opinions in opposition to some of his methods and decisions—in many cases from those who were heartily in sympathy with the objects he had in view. Even those, however, who differ with him recognize not only Dr. Wiley's sincerity but his ability and remarkable achievements. His career as Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry came to a close in the midst of conflict. Any man following Dr. Wiley would have the difficulty encountered always by the successor of a strong man, and besides would inherit the animosities created in the course of the conflict. As Dr. Wiley's successor President Taft has named Dr. Carl L. Alsberg. Since 1908 Dr. Alsberg has been a chemist in the Bureau of Plant Industry, and has made a specialty of working on plants that are poisonous to live stock. Before that he had been in charge of the Department of Biological Chemistry of the Harvard Medical School. He is a graduate of Columbia University in the class of 1896, and of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which is the Columbia Medical School. He has done research work in Germany, both in Frankfort-on-the-Main and in Berlin. He brings to his work an unquestionable devotion to the public welfare, and the sort of efficient honesty that is everywhere needed in the public service. The President has pursued the wise course of promoting to a place of higher responsibility a public servant who has proved his adherence to high ideals and his fidelity to the public welfare in a lower position. In doing this the President has exemplified in a practical way a procedure which should prevail, and we believe some day will prevail, throughout the Civil Service. Dr. Alsberg's capacity for the task intrusted to him will be severely tested. Public opinion should give him the support that is necessary if he is to have a good opportunity to show his fitness for the difficult post.

The Commission on Industrial Relations

The other instance of the exercise by the President of his appointing power is his selection of the members of the Commission on Industrial Relations. Our readers will undoubtedly remember that Congress a few months ago established by law a Commission to take up the question of the relations between capital and labor in this country. That law was passed as the result of the urgency of a group of men and women who are deeply interested in labor questions and the establishment of industrial conditions on a sound basis. These men and women were formed into a committee, and it was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through the influence of this committee that Congress passed the act. On that committee were such men as Professor Samuel McCune Lindsay, of Columbia University; Professor Jeremiah W. Jenks, formerly of Cornell and now of the New York University; Dr. Edward T. Devine, of the New York School of Philanthropy; Mr. John A. Kingsbury, of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor; Mr. Owen R. Lovejoy, of the National Child Labor Committee. In recommending the legislation, President Taft declared that the time was ripe "for a searching inquiry into the subject of industrial relations which shall be official, authoritative, balanced, and well rounded." At the head of this Commission Mr. Taft has appointed Senator Sutherland, of Utah, an able lawyer of the conservative type. Senator Sutherland was one of the majority on the Ballinger-Pinchot Committee that sustained Mr. Ballinger. The other appointees of the Commission include representatives of employers and employees. Those representing employees were suggested by the American Federation of Labor. The appointments are subject to rejection or confirmation by the Senate. At a recent meeting of the committee through which the movement on behalf of the Commission originated, a statement was adopted expressing disappointment at the selections the President had made. As the President would constitute it, the Commission, in the opinion of those who signed this statement, is not such as to promise the sort of inquiry that is needed, though some of the men named are able and distinguished. The committee making this statement note that no woman is named on the Commission, although there are more than six million women wage-earners in the Nation; that there is no economist or social worker to bring to such an inquiry the knowledge acquired by experience in university study and in the work of social organizations, and that "the Commission lacks men of such public prominence in this special field of inquiry as to give assurance that the enlightened *public* interest, which is the chief interest at stake in this most important task, will be adequately represented." When the question of confirmation comes up in the Senate, the personnel of the Commission should be thoroughly considered, for upon that will largely depend the success or failure of the inquiry with which it is charged.

The Attempted Assassination of Lord Hardinge

Last week at Delhi, India, Baron and Baroness Hardinge, the Viceroy and Vicereine, barely escaped assassination. They were making their ceremonial entry into Delhi, the new Imperial capital. About a year ago King George V laid the first stones of the new city. His previous announcement that the capital of India would be moved to Delhi from Calcutta—a purely commercial place—appealed strongly to the native imagination. In Delhi the Hindus see the embodiment of some of their sacred legends which come down to them from the dawn of history. In Delhi the Mohammedans see the ancient and sacred capital of their Mogul emperors. The announcement also appealed to the practical sense of all the people, whether British or Indians. For, unlike Calcutta, the new capital enjoys a central position geographically, is in immediate contact with very many varied types of Indian society, and is a well-known meeting-point of diverse races and creeds. This place is to be the living center of British rule in India. The main criticism of the capital's transfer seems to have come from those, whether natives or British, interested in the prestige of Calcutta. Last week's assassin, who has not yet been found, may have been some Bengali who resented the loss to the province of Bengal of the seat of government of all India. Or he may have been some Mohammedan fanatic protesting against a British superimposing of a capital on the ancient Mogul capital. Or he may have been moved by some private grievance. Or he may have been simply an irresponsible maniac, unmoved either by fancied public wrong or private grudge. The outrage occurred as Lord and Lady Hardinge were passing through the principal street of Delhi, a long, narrow lane lined with houses mostly only a story high. Thus the assassin, who stood on a roof when he threw the bomb, was only a few feet from the Viceroy and Vicereine in their howdah—or the great box in which persons sit when riding elephants. The howdah was covered with imperial purple drapery decorated with gold lace. In front, between the elephant's ears, sat the driver guiding the animal in the usual way by tapping him on the forehead with a steel spike. Behind the howdah stood an attendant holding over the heads of those within a great parasol, which indicates the royal dignity. As the bomb burst the attendant was instantly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

killed, as was a boy up in a tree watching the procession; but the Viceroy, Vicereine, and the driver all but miraculously escaped death; indeed, Lady Hardinge was unharmed. Her husband and the driver were wounded in many places, the bomb's splinters entering their necks, backs, and shoulders. The howdah was blown to match-wood. As it is an honored British tradition that a ceremony once begun must go on, no matter what happens, Sir Guy Wilson, Financial Member of the Viceroy's Council, took Lord Hardinge's place in the procession. The march was continued to the Durbar camp near the old fort which played a prominent part in the mutiny of 1857. Here were gathered a great number of native chiefs and British officials, who showed intense indignation at the dastardly deed. This is not surprising, for Lord Hardinge has proved to be a popular Viceroy.

The Map of Europe: The Balkan Proposals

Last week was important in the remaking of the map of Europe. In accordance with the traditions of Oriental diplomacy, there was much preliminary skirmishing at the London Conference between the delegates from the allies—Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, and Greece—on the one side and from Turkey on the other. Finally the allies announced the following conditions precedent to a conclusion of the present Balkan war. Their demands were:

The cession by Turkey of all the territory west of a line starting from a point east of Rodosto on the Sea of Marmora and ending at the Bay of Malatra on the Black Sea. The peninsula of Gallipoli is excluded. [Thus Turkey is called upon to cede all of Macedonia and almost all of Thrace.]

The cession of all the Ægean Islands.

The cession of all Turkish rights in the island of Crete.

The erection of the province of Albania into an autonomous province under Turkish suzerainty but not sovereignty.

The terms of finance to be agreed on later.

Doubtless the allies propose more than they expect ultimately to get. Certainly these terms seem startling to those who have been wont to think of Turkey as intrenched in Europe. It is true that Turkey-in-Europe has greatly shrunk from what it was at the height of its power in the middle of the sixteenth century. It then dominated Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia, Hungary, Rumania, and some of the Black Sea northern shore line. It has now shrunk to less than a quarter of this size. But the allies would have it now shrink to one-thirtieth of its present size! In other words, they would reduce Turkey from about the size of the State of Missouri to a district about as large as the State of Delaware. The area of Turkey on the mainland of Europe exceeds sixty-five thousand square miles. If the allies' demands are acceded to, the Sultan would be sovereign over only about two thousand square miles in Europe. Since the Congress of Vienna parceled out Napoleon's empire, no nation has been summoned to surrender as much European territory as this. Nor is this all. If we include the Ægean Islands, the Turkish territory amounts to over seventy-one thousand square miles. It is proposed that she lose these islands too. They are all now occupied either by Italy as a result of the Italo-Turkish war, or by Greece as a result of the present war. So much for territory. The strategic value of what remains to Turkey, however, is of vital worth. The peninsulas of Constantinople and Gallipoli assure to Turkey command, the one of the Bosphorus, the other of the Dardanelles. The desire of the Turks to retain Adrianople is easily understood, whether on sentimental, strategic, commercial, or political grounds. To meet this, the Bulgarians have placed against it their own relinquishment of Rodosto on the Sea of Marmora. Of course, if the Bulgarians remained at Rodosto, Constantinople would seem to be at their mercy.

The Map of Europe: The Turkish Proposals

At the end of the week the Turkish delegates at London made their counter proposals of peace. As reported, they are as follows:

The retention by Turkey of all the territory east of a line from the Ægean Sea to the Black Sea [this includes Adrianople and most of Thrace], the territory to continue to be absolutely under Turkish sovereignty.

Autonomy under Turkish suzerainty to be conferred on the territory west of this line. [This includes the rest of Turkey-in-Europe.]

Bulgaria to be allowed commercial privileges on the Ægean Sea similar to those to be allowed to Servia on the Adriatic.

No war indemnity to be paid by Turkey.

Thus while the allies say, "Give us practically all Turkey-in-Europe," the Turks reply, "We will keep Turkey-in-Europe, but will grant certain privileges." In both sets of demands, it will be noted, stress is laid upon the distinction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between "sovereignty" and "suzerainty." Sovereignty means actual supremacy; suzerainty generally means something less than absolute power. Thus the Balkan allies offer to recognize Albanian autonomy under the Sultan's suzerainty, but not under his sovereignty. Albania would become what Crete has been in its relation to Turkey; that is to say, the Sultan would be the nominal ruler, but without the political, administrative, and military power which he would have as sovereign. As to the feeling among the peoples involved, that in Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, and Greece is reported as being strenuously insistent upon an immediate acceptance of the conditions put forth, otherwise the London Conference would be broken off, the fighting resumed, and the Turk, this time, really swept out of Europe. For such fighting, however, the Turks are in far better condition than at the beginning of the armistice. Hence, on the Turkish side, with this heartening conviction, the demands of the allies were quickly scouted as being both arrogant and impossible. An immediate renewal of the war was called for as preferable to the consideration of anything so humiliating. The Turkish newspapers also unanimously oppose the conditions outlined by the allies, and add that Turkey sent delegates to London to arrange peace, not to commit suicide.

The Balkan War: Atrocities

While the Peace Conference was in progress last week in London, the Turkish Government repeated to the six great Powers—England, France, Russia, Germany, Austria, Italy—the demand made by it a month ago for a consular inquiry respecting the atrocities alleged to have been committed by Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, and Greece in the Turkish territory occupied by them. It is unfortunate that the prowess of these Balkan allies should be sullied by reports of atrocities. We are wont to attribute all such reported outrages to the Turks. Indeed, the massacres in eastern Macedonia by the Turks who fled before the Bulgarian advance, in western Macedonia and southern Albania by those who fled before the Greek advance, and the massacres in central Macedonia by those who fled before the Servian advance, are hardly offset by the later reports of atrocities committed by the Bulgarians and Greeks. According to the correspondent of the London "Times," the Turks burned a number of villages and put a great number of Christian families to death before the entry of the Bulgarians; this so angered the Bulgarians that, ignoring the promise which had been made to respect the lives of the citizens, they slaughtered a large number of innocent victims. Further light on some of these massacres, says the correspondent, indicates that they were committed by Armenians who joined the Bulgarian army as volunteers. From Salonika, the greatest of the Ægean ports, a dynamite depot was exploded by the Bulgarians, killing many unoffending Mohammedans. It is not necessary to suppose that all these outrages were committed by soldiers, for the armies are followed by men whom the officers do not control. As to the Greeks, their apparently generous agreement, when they captured the city, to the Turkish plea that the native army should be disarmed by its own officers, was unfairly taken advantage of; Turkish soldiers were afterwards found in possession of implements of warfare. This was made the excuse for searching all Turks—the numerous Jews in Salonika, representing half the population, being of course subjected to the same process. Arms were not the only object of the search as it developed; large numbers of Mohammedans were robbed of objects of value. At nightfall, it is said, the soldiers of the two armies gave themselves up to wholesale looting. Even from the three great mosques of the city—which were once Christian churches and have survived from the fifth and seventh centuries—helpless Mohammedan refugees were rudely taken, robbed of their few possessions, and left, tentless and starving, exposed to cold and rain, amid the filth engendered by the absence of sanitary arrangements. Of course such brutality is disavowed by the heads of both armies. The Greeks are endeavoring to care for the forty thousand refugees in Salonika by a committee at the head of which is their Queen, who, with the King, is now in that city. This committee has adopted effective measures to insure sanitation. All cases of infectious and contagious disease are reported to the authorities, and hospitals for the care of these patients have been opened. The water supply and the municipal scavenging system are being reorganized, and an extensive medical service has been arranged. In other words, civilization seems replacing uncivilized conditions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Edouard Detaille Last week Edouard Detaille passed away, at the comparatively early age of sixty-four. The event draws attention to the kind of painting in which he and Meissonier were the most brilliant examples. Of the two names, Meissonier's is the more famous; but Detaille's is also notable. The two men saw much of each other. Detaille was Meissonier's pupil, and the first picture ever exhibited by the disciple represented "A Corner of Meissonier's Studio." But while other kinds of *genre* as well as of military life attracted the elder artist, the principal attraction to the younger was that which he made his life-work—a delineation of scenes from a soldier's life, with every detail minutely and truthfully but very smoothly rendered. At the very next Salon following the one in which he had exhibited the Meissonier studio scene he exhibited the famous "Halt of Infantry." It instantly attracted the praise of the critics, among them of Edmund About, who, in an article published in the "Revue des Deux Mondes," called it "a jewel." The following year Detaille's "Repose During Drill" firmly established his position, and he received more commissions than he could execute. Then followed the Franco-German War, giving to the artist a horrible wealth of material. And Detaille knew how to use this material not only to tell his usual martial story but also to awaken sympathy for his beloved France. Take his "Conquerors," for instance, in which German soldiers are carting off furniture from Paris houses—the ground is covered with snow; in the distance are the towers of Notre Dame and Saint Sulpice, and the dome of the Invalides. One feels the chill and the desolation and the humiliation of the scene. In this country there are some notable examples of the painter's work—"The Passing Regiment" at the Corcoran Gallery at Washington, for instance, and "A French Cuirassier" and "1814" in the Metropolitan Museum, New York City. In these pictures we realize anew Henry Houssaye's remark that "Detaille recalls that famous general who said on the eve of a campaign, 'We are ready, quite ready; we lack not a gaiter button.' Detaille's soldiers are of this sort. Their equipment is complete. The cuirasses are well polished, and the horses conscientiously curried. Not a grain of dust. Their hairs are laid according to rule. The packages are all in order. The sergeant of the week finds nothing to criticise in this correct arrangement." We may not be so ready, however, to add the scathing remark with which Houssaye concluded his criticism: "Although they seem to come from the enameler's oven, Detaille's pretty soldiers have never seen fire."

Slaughtering the Birds by Law Under the laws of the several States and owing also to the neglect of the National Legislature, a large amount of bird life, vitally important to the agricultural interests of the whole country, is rapidly diminishing. Congress has persistently refused to pass measures for the preservation of our bird life. Three bills are now pending. While the several States have enacted laws regulating the killing of birds, the temptation for each State to secure a full share of game birds during spring and fall migrations has prevented effective State supervision. Bag limits in nearly all States are far too generous. Conditions under State regulation have been such that experts say that only closed seasons for ten years can save some of our most valuable species from utter extermination. Of the three measures now before Congress, the Committee on Wild Life Protection of the Fourth National Conservation Congress, which met in Indianapolis last October, favors the McLean Bill, providing that "all migratory game and insectivorous birds shall hereafter be deemed to be within the custody and protection of the Government of the United States," and that they shall not be destroyed except under restrictive regulations of the Department of Agriculture. There are six hundred and ten species of migratory birds belonging to the whole Nation and undergoing slaughter under sanction of State laws. While the conservation of non-migratory birds on the part of each State is to be hoped for, immediate National legislation in behalf of birds during their northern and southern migratory passages and during their stay in different States is imperative. To this end the Department of Agriculture should be authorized to adopt suitable regulations as to closed seasons and protection, paying due attention to breeding habits, zones, temperature, times and lines of migration. Any one to whom the arguments for the protection of bird life appeal cannot do less than direct the attention of his Congressman to the need of a Federal migratory bird law.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The crime against the birds" has sometimes been used as a catch phrase. The crime is much more than a sentimental one which appeals to a natural love of plentiful wild life and the tunefulness of songsters. The five million men and boys who every year go to the fields and forests to slaughter our game and song birds levy on the pocketbook of every farmer and consumer. The birds which, through their war on insect life, have come by the name of "crop protectors" are the ones most rapidly disappearing. The loss in agricultural products consequent on the increase in the hordes of destructive insects is no slight item in the high cost of foodstuffs.

The Extent of the Loss

The average man who knows that birds do protect the crops seems to underestimate the extent of the economic loss involved in the present slaughter. The Hessian fly in 1900 destroyed 2,577,000 acres of wheat in Indiana and Ohio; whereas ornithologists cite numerous examples showing how birds in vast numbers in Australia and in our West have averted the desolation of large territories threatened by insect pests. The United States Biological Survey is responsible for the estimate that the natural increase of one pair of gypsy moths, if unchecked, would defoliate the United States in eight years. Reports of the Bureau of Entomology declare that the destruction of crops in consequence of the decrease in the number of birds is constantly increasing. The annual loss is now estimated by Professor Forbush, the State Ornithologist of Massachusetts, to be $800,000,000! That the United States has one remaining passenger pigeon in captivity may well serve to emphasize the pity of the situation. Scores of species that sportsmen and pot-hunters are allowed to shoot for sport and for sale are of immense value to agriculture. Thus thirty species of shore birds eat noxious weeds. Gunners shooting legally are destroying one hundred and fifty-four species of insect-eating birds classed by law as "game" in both the North and the South, while in the South they are also slaughtering many song-birds, including the robin, similarly classified. In seven States—Louisiana, Mississippi, Maryland, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and Florida—the robin is annually and legally killed as game! Five States expressly permit the killing of blackbirds as game. Cranes are shot for food in Colorado, Nevada, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Oklahoma. Doves in twenty-six States, at a great loss to the farmers, are likewise killed as game. And these are merely cited as examples; many other useful birds are being destroyed. It would indeed seem illogical for the legislators of a nation engaged in a conservation movement longer to hesitate to enact a Federal migratory bird law for the protection of an asset that belongs to the whole people as well as to the gunners among the people. It is manifestly unfair for one State fatally to impair a volume of bird life passing through many States and advantageously affecting commerce and agriculture everywhere.

The Mission of the University

It is one of the good signs of the time that our colleges in various parts of the country are working out university extension schemes to extend the benefit of college instruction to the general community. The effect of this is not only beneficial to the community, but not less so to the college, since it connects the college with life, gives the college professors, and to some extent the college student, acquaintance with the outside world and its problems, and so makes the regular academic instruction more vital and practical. Two illustrations of this are furnished by recent enlargements of the work of the New York University and of the University of Virginia. The New York University has called to its faculty Professor Jeremiah W. Jenks, who has organized what he calls "The University Forum," which will furnish during the year 1912–1913 a special course of lectures and discussions on practical public questions, such as the Control of Vice and Crime, the Relation of Government to Corporations, Socialism, Woman Suffrage, etc., etc. For example, not merely professional students but the general public have need to know what the Socialists do really advocate and what would be the effect on government and industry of the triumph of Socialism. Mr. Berger, the first Socialist to be elected to Congress, will present the views of the Socialists on January 31; Mr. Coler, former Comptroller of the city of New York, will present the opposing view on February 7; and Professor Jenks will sum up the case as a kind of presiding judge on February 14. Students in the University attending this University Forum and doing the required reading and passing a satisfactory examination will receive

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

college credit for it. Others than students may also enroll for the course. The University of Virginia has organized a course of extension lectures throughout the State, among them one which particularly appeals to us, "A State Campaign for the School Child's Health." This is conducted for the benefit of the teachers in conferences at teaching institutes, and conducted for the benefit of the pupils in talks of from thirty to forty minutes to pupils above the fourth grade. Professor Hecks's plan, as it is explained in the October number of the Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia, is well worth examination by educational leaders in other States. The general principle underlying both of these and other analogous university courses is well stated in a sentence by Dr. Alderman, the President of the University of Virginia: "The ultimate mission of the State university in America will be to supply this training, not only to the fortunate few who can repair to its walls, but to all the people who constitute the life of the State."

Dangerous Immigrants

Last year, through evidence obtained by a field officer of the Department of Commerce and Labor, two Greek steamship companies whose ships plied between Piræus and New York were caught landing diseased and criminal aliens on our shores. The agent of one of these lines, together with several of the ship's officers and crew, have since been awarded periods of reflection, varying from two months to one year, in the Federal Prison at Atlanta. Five of the officers of the ship of the other line are sharing a like fate. The general officers of the two companies are under indictment, but, unfortunately, cannot be extradited and brought here for trial. The procedure of these steamship companies was as follows: Immigrants landing from the steamship at Ellis Island and ordered to be deported were told on the return voyage that they could go back and enter this country without examination if they would pay full fare plus a bonus and ship as members of the crew. The charge varied from two hundred to five hundred francs. They would then be entered on the ship's articles as stokers, sailors, stewards, stewardesses, or cabin boys. After the ship docked in New York they would quietly walk ashore and disappear. In a similar manner immigrants who had been rejected because of disease by the medical examiner of the steamship line would ship as sailors and so get an entrance into the country. Not long ago a Greek immigrant who had a candy store in Texas returned to Greece to bring over his wife and children. When he and his family applied for passage on one of the lines in question, the wife was rejected by the physicians because she was seriously afflicted with trachoma (a contagious eye disease very prevalent in southern and eastern Europe). Thereupon it was suggested to the husband that by paying first-cabin rates he could have his wife entered on the ship's articles as a stewardess and bring her into America without inspection. This was done. The wife was vigorously polishing silverware when the inspectors from Ellis Island boarded the vessel. The husband and children went to Ellis Island and were passed by the inspectors. A little later the wife went quietly ashore and joined them. The same method has been pursued in getting admission for criminals. These facts ought to make it clear to Congress that its proposed literary tests will do nothing to guard this country against the worst kind of immigration, and that it is a first duty of Congress to devise, as recommended by the recent Immigration Commission, some method for the muster and inspection of all alien members of ship's companies before they be permitted to land.

THE NEW YEAR

WHAT WE EXPECT IN 1913

It is well occasionally to look back and take account of the past. It is better occasionally to look forward and prepare for the future. The American journals will be full of brief summaries of what has been in 1912. We invite our readers to look forward and anticipate what may be expected to occur in 1913. Such anticipations help prepare one to do his share in promoting the progress which he has anticipated.

The United States in 1913 will enter upon an experimental Democratic administration. We expect that before the expiration of the year the latent division in that party between the advocates of popular welfare and the advocates of special privilege—that is, between the progressive and the reactionary Democrats—will become very apparent. We do not expect that President Wilson will surrender to the "invisible government." We do not expect that the "invisible government" will surrender to President Wilson. But we do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expect that under his administration, and under the campaign of education promised by the Progressive party, the invisible government will become more and more visible. And before the four years of Democratic administration are ended we expect that there will be a new alignment of parties. One will stand for a Republic of self-governing individuals; the other for a self-governing Republic. One will fear a strong government; the other will fear a weak government. Both will be democratic parties, but of different types. Both will advocate the rights of the people, but by different methods. The first will be the party of conservatism, the second the party of progress. The Outlook will not be the organ of either party, but neither will it be a disinterested spectator. It will advocate social justice and political reform, and it will commend and give its moral support to any measures and any public men that promise to promote social justice and develop political reform.

We expect the movement in England for greater equality of political rights and educational and industrial opportunity to go on until the last vestige of feudalism is abolished. We expect to see something like a federal system adopted, and eventually a larger self-government established, not only for Ireland, but for Scotland and Wales as well, and some central body organized, or developed from existing organizations, in which the various colonies and dependencies of the Empire will be represented. We expect that the habit engendered by feudalism, under which the common people depended on an autocratic government for the protection of their rights and the promotion of their interests, will not be easily thrown off, and as a result the democracy of England will be modified by a species of paternalism. And we shall watch with great interest to see whether a democratic England will develop and maintain the same world power which has been acquired and maintained by the English aristocracy.

We expect to see the world movement towards a larger liberty and a truer justice, that is, toward a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, move steadily forward during 1913, though not without excesses and reactions. We expect to see the Republic in France make further progress toward stability and further escape from the traditions of Bourbonism on the one hand and of the Revolution on the other. We expect to see the Social Democracy in Germany continue to make gains in political power, and eventually substitute a peaceful democratic State for an imperialistic State dominated by militarism. We expect to see the spirit of liberty develop in Russia, in spite of the efforts of the bureaucracy to repress it, but we do not expect to see any immediate violent revolution. We expect to see recognition granted by our Government to the Republic of China, and other countries follow the lead of America, which might well have taken the lead in 1912. We are not certain about the perpetuity of the Republic, but we think the Manchu dynasty has gone forever. We expect that the colonial policy of the United States in the Philippines will continue to influence the colonial policy of other world powers, and especially we expect to see a gradual development of native representation in the British colonial administrations in India, southern Africa, and Egypt. And we hope we shall see the friendly relations between this country and Japan not only continued but strengthened, in spite of the panicky fears and the race prejudices incited by the yellow journals of both countries.

The movement for the emancipation of woman, which dates from about the beginning of the nineteenth century, has opened to her the doors of high schools, academies, colleges, and universities, and has made possible for her all vocations except those from which her own tastes, inclinations, and physique exclude her, such as those of lumberman, porter, teamster, and the like. We can hardly expect to see in 1913 society finally and fully adapt itself to the new ideal; but we do expect to see the companionship between man and woman, both within and without the family, made truer, nobler, more elevating to both as the result of this freedom from the shackles of the past. We expect to see the world movement for giving woman a right to an equal share in the responsibilities of government make further progress, in spite of the incredible and criminal folly of the militant suffragettes; but we do not expect that the majority of women will ever take a very active part in ordinary political administration, or a very active interest in ordinary political problems, and we expect neither the evils which some forebode nor the benefits which some anticipate from the change. History gives us no reason to suppose that the feminine politician will be any purer, more patriotic, or more disinterested than the masculine politician.

We expect to see the public school system,

DRURY COLLEGE LIBRARY
Springfield, Missouri
42456

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which was born in the eighteenth century and developed in the nineteenth, so extended that, at no very distant date, in all countries possessing a representative government popular education will be taken from the control of the Church and put under the control of the State, and an educational opportunity will be furnished by the State to all its children.

We expect to see what is called Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church and New Theology in the Protestant Churches spread in ever-widening circles, supplanting everywhere the religion of wrath and fear by the religion of love and hope. We see in the acceptance given to the philosophical writings of Eucken and Bergson, both by philosophers and by the laity, a reaction against the materialism of a certain group of scientists and the fatalism of a certain group of theologians. And we expect to see a growing recognition of the truth that man is a spiritual being endowed with a real freedom of the will, and as a result a great impulse given to moral and social progress in 1913—an impulse which may well be called a revival of religion, though it will be quite unlike the revivals of religion of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

We expect to see the Protestant churches getting together, not by agreeing upon a common creed, but by uniting in a common service, inspired by a common purpose and by loyalty to their common Master. We do not expect to see the Vatican abandon its claim to temporal sovereignty and become reconciled to the separation of Church and State in Italy, and so to the Italian Government, though we sincerely wish that we might hope for so beneficent an event. But we do expect to see Protestants and Roman Catholics, especially in the United States, co-operating in every good work for the public well-being, rivals and competitors only in the unselfishness and the efficiency of their service.

We expect to see the Church increasingly work to bring about the answer to its daily prayer, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, *on earth*. We expect to see it, in its missionary work both at home and abroad, decreasingly animated by the spirit of denominational propaganda, and increasingly animated by the spirit of unselfish service to promote human happiness and develop divineness of character.

It is said that "the wish is father to the thought." Perhaps it is. Perhaps our expectations here expressed are the children of our desire. But, none the less, we think that the history of the nineteenth century and the signs of life in the present give the reverent student of his time a right to enter upon the year 1913 with high endeavor and exultant hope.

"NATIONAL ASSETS"

Under the title above quoted Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith, at the recent meeting of the American Academy of Arts and Letters in New York City, read a paper which deserves more than passing attention. The National Assets to which he referred are not mines, railways, water powers, great forests, and fertile fields, but the individual men who, in either civil or military life, have influenced American thought and action. Mr. Smith has been struck with the tendency in this country to pay tributes of respect and admiration to our dead statesmen and heroes, while our living public servants are often overwhelmed with a perfect cataract of criticism and abuse. To the first class belong Washington, Lincoln, Grant, Lee, and other heroes of our wars; as illustrations of the second class Mr. Smith refers to Dewey, Hobson, Sampson, Schley, and to the prominent candidates in almost any election campaign.

We believe that Mr. Smith has hit upon what may be called the besetting sin of American journalism, if not of the American people. It is small comfort to recall that the same vice of partisan mud-slinging is found in English political life as well as on this side of the Atlantic. John Bright, Cobden, and Gladstone—devoted patriots, self-sacrificing laborers in the cause of human progress—were denounced by some of their contemporaries with billingsgate that would make the most hardened Tammany politician blush. Nor is this vicious habit of personal abuse to be found only in recent American life, although, as Mr. Smith points out, it has been exploited, cultivated, and made more widespread by that distinctively American invention, the yellow journal. Washington, who is now commonly supposed to have been from the very first the idol of his fellow-countrymen, was accused by his political opponents of graft and embezzlement, and suffered so from personal political abuse that he greeted with joy the day when he left the Presidency; Lincoln, Grant, Cleveland, endured the same wrongs; and we are only just beginning to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

learn from the historical and personal records of the reconstruction period that Andrew Johnson suffered from this kind of injustice.

In the address to which we have referred Mr. Smith intimates his belief that the chief cause of this unjust treatment of great contemporary Americans is to be found in the selfish and abandoned commercialism of a certain type of newsmonger who "discovered that while one can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar, there swarmed a very large mass who could be tempted with carrion. There followed the still further discovery that this last procedure could be made to pay commercially—in some instances to pay enormously."

This sort of treatment of our public men is inherently unjust and therefore repellent to every man who believes in the principle of common justice. Mr. Smith calls attention to two particular directions in which it injects special evil into American life. First, consider what must be the effect upon the mind of the immigrants coming to our shore, the great majority of them to-day being from those countries in which reading, writing, and the processes of careful and balanced thought have been dwarfed or destroyed by bad systems of education. What will they think when they are told by the only journals to which they have access that every office-holder is corrupt, that every rich man is an oppressor, and that the United States exists merely to maintain a despotism more sordid and brutal than that from which they have fled—the despotism of money?

Second, and more important still, what do the young men graduating from our schools and colleges by the thousands think of this treatment of the men who achieve positions of prominence and influence in American life? What incentive is there to the young man to enter public life "when one of the rewards—sometimes the only reward—is the ridicule and contempt heaped upon him?"

Is there any remedy for this state of things? Mr. Smith's reply to this question is so convincing that we give it to our readers in his own language:

> The remedy lies with ourselves. With you, and with me, and with every soul who boasts a ten-commandment conscience. Let me recall them for you.
>
> "Love thy God." Certainly, we say, with the greatest of pleasure.
>
> "Thou shalt not steal." Of course not; no gentleman ever does.
>
> "Thou shalt do no murder." By no manner of means. . . . How dare you insult me?
>
> "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Here follows a dead silence! That is, thou shalt not steal his good name, nor murder his career, nor brand him as a criminal or a fool—these ten commandments, remember, being ten rods bound together by a ribbon of justice, mercy, and peace; to keep one means to keep all.
>
> The sum of the ten is, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you"—the law of the square deal.
>
> We keep its letter and its spirit best when we honor the names and uphold the hands of the men who are our true National Assets.

LETTERS TO UNKNOWN FRIENDS

Some of my Unknown Friends apparently think that I have too little regard for the importance of a creed as the basis of a church organization. I confess frankly to a prejudice on this subject, growing out of two chapters in my life-experience. Perhaps the narration of these two chapters may serve partially to explain my attitude respecting creeds to some of my Unknown Friends, and perhaps to justify that attitude to others among them.

The first church to which I was invited was the First Congregational Church of Terre Haute, Indiana. I went there knowing nothing of the church; the church knew nothing of me except through a letter of recommendation from a common friend. I went to supply the pulpit during the temporary absence of its pastor for a year of vacation, and, on his resignation before that year had expired, I was chosen as his successor. I found there a Congregational church, the strongest Protestant church, financially and socially, in the growing city, with practically no Congregational churches in the vicinity. There was one small Congregational church ten or twelve miles to the west; the nearest Congregational church to the east was in Indianapolis, and that was not a strong one. The history of this Congregational church in Terre Haute, Indiana, interested me. I am writing this reminiscence without any attempt to refresh my recollection by referring to letters or documents, and in some details it may be incorrect. As I recall the history, it was something like this:

Dr. Jewett had been educated under an Independent Presbyterian minister in Baltimore, Maryland, and twenty-five years before I went to Terre Haute had started for the West to find a missionary field, for he was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

full of a missionary enthusiasm. This was, if my recollection serves me aright, about the year 1835. He landed in Terre Haute, Indiana, on a Friday night, made the acquaintance of a Terre Haute citizen in the hotel, and went with him on a hunting expedition upon the prairie on Saturday. There was only one church in the town, an Old School Presbyterian church of the Southern type, extremely Calvinistic, extremely narrow, and with a very small congregation. The only other preaching place was the Court-House. When any itinerant minister happened that way, the Court-House bell was rung and he preached to such congregation as might chance to gather.

Dr. Jewett's Terre Haute acquaintance was attracted toward him and invited him to preach on the Sunday following their hunting expedition. He accepted the invitation; the bell was rung, a congregation came together, and heard a sermon such as they had perhaps never heard before, for Dr. Jewett was a natural orator, as his subsequent history proved. The people gathered about him at the close of the service, and urged him to remain another week and preach the following Sunday. They answered his objections by saying that he might travel far before he would find a better missionary field than Terre Haute. He yielded to their persuasions, preached the following Sunday, and at the close of the sermon called on all those who were willing to unite in forming a Christian church to meet upon the next day for that purpose.

Something like a score answered the invitation—a few men, more women—who had come from different localities and had been brought up in different churches, and whose traditional creeds were widely different. They agreed to form a Christian church. This was not, however, the only support which this church in its cradle was to have. There were business men in the town who desired its prosperity, and who argued, very wisely, that they could not expect immigrants to settle in the town, which had already reached a considerable size, if there were no growing church in it. So they were willing, for real estate and business reasons, to contribute to the cause.

Thus the First Congregational Church of Terre Haute, Indiana, was born by the spontaneous coming together of Christians of different traditional creeds, different temperaments, different religious habits. For ten years this church went on without any creed of any description. It grew apace. It became the church of the town. It raised the necessary funds to put up a church building adequate for its purpose. Then, partly because it felt the need of fellowship, partly because other Congregational churches had been formed in the vicinity and wished its fellowship, it adopted a simple Congregational creed and became a Congregational church. But when I went there, fifteen years after this creed had been adopted, I did not find that this creed was the real basis of church fellowship. That basis was a common purpose to promote Christian life in the community.

And yet this church had not only the largest and best church edifice in the city, and the widest moral influence; it had sustained for twenty-five years a preacher of rare pulpit power, one who was regarded by many as the rival in eloquence of Henry Ward Beecher, who was then settled over a Presbyterian church in Indianapolis. It had gathered a church membership of some two hundred, and a successful Sunday-school of perhaps two-thirds that number. And under the joint ministry of Henry Ward Beecher and Dr. Jewett revivals had been conducted with remarkable success in western Indiana, affecting not merely the churches of those two pastors, not merely the two cities of Terre Haute and Indianapolis, but also all the region round about.

But the bond which united the membership of this church was not a common creed, it was a common purpose to do the Master's work in the spirit of the Master. One illustration of this fact may serve to make the spirit of the church clear to my readers. A member of the congregation, brought up as a Quaker, and therefore not believing in the church ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, desired to unite with the church because he desired to confess his faith in Christ. He objected, however, to baptism. I told him that I would submit to the church the question whether they would admit him without baptism. I promised to urge his admission, and I thought it would be granted, though not without objection; but I asked him if he had any objection to baptism if his views on the subject were frankly stated, and he said no. I stated his views to the church; he was unanimously admitted to the church, and received baptism, it being explained at the time to the congregation that he received it as a concession to others, not because it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was in accordance with his views of the teaching of the New Testament.

I was pastor of this church throughout the Civil War, which in that portion of the West was a far greater trial to Christian fellowship than in most Eastern communities. We were not far from the border line; we were surrounded by men who sympathized with the South and hoped for its victory; we were on more than one occasion threatened with raids by Southern cavalry. A considerable proportion of the congregation had come either from Southern or from border States. They were loyal to the Government, but were either in favor of or indifferent to slavery. In fact, I can recall only one family in the church that could have been called anti-slavery according to the New England standards. I went there fresh from the inspiration of Henry Ward Beecher's preaching, and carried into the pulpit the lessons which I had learned from him and the spirit with which he had imbued me, though without the eloquence which he possessed. Nevertheless, this church remained united, with only three or four secessions from it, throughout the war, bound together, not by the creed which was in its archives, but by the Christian purpose which had brought its members together and kept them in a brotherhood for ten years without any creed whatever.

In 1887, on the death of Henry Ward Beecher, I was called at first to supply the pulpit and then to become the pastor of Plymouth Church, to which he by his preaching had given an international reputation. I found here a church of somewhat more than fifteen hundred resident members; my recollection is that there were over two thousand on the roll; a church which under Mr. Beecher had a congregation that crowded it to the doors, and in which not only every seat but all standing room was generally occupied; a church which had enjoyed two or three remarkable revivals, and in which it was rare that a communion season passed without some additions to its membership through conversion; a church which sustained two missionary chapels, with their Sunday-schools and Sunday services, besides its own Sunday-school; a church whose influence for justice and liberty was second to none in the country, and whose membership was in numbers excelled by only one or two. And yet this church had, since 1870, ceased to require the assent of members to its simple creed, which remained in the records of the church for historical rather than for doctrinal purposes, and had substituted therefor the following simple covenant:

> Do you now avouch the Lord Jehovah to be your God, Jesus Christ to be your Saviour, the Holy Spirit to be your Sanctifier? Renouncing the dominion of this world over you, do you consecrate your whole soul and body to the service of God? Do you receive His word as the rule of your life, and, by His grace assisting you, will you persevere in this consecration unto the end?

In the membership of this church were men who theologically believed with John Calvin, or at least in modern Calvinism, and men who believed in the theology of John Wesley; men who believed in infant baptism and men who believed only in adult baptism; men who believed in eternal punishment, men who believed in universal restoration, and men who had no definite belief on the subject; men who believed in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and men who declined to have any opinion on the metaphysical relations of Jesus Christ to the Eternal; men who accepted the verbal inspiration of the Bible and men who regarded the Bible with reverence, but with discriminating reverence, as a revelation of the Father, but a revelation in and through the experience of his children. But all of them agreed in a very sincere desire to learn the truth of life from Jesus Christ and to do Christ's work in the Christ spirit. This church had been through fiery trials. It had seen its pastor denounced as a heretic, denounced even as a criminal. It had seen the denomination to which it belonged agitated by theological debates which at one time threatened its integrity. It had been the occasion of the greatest Congregational Council ever held in the history of the Congregational body. And yet I venture to say that a more united church was not to be found anywhere throughout the American Republic. It was united, not by its creed, that is, not by a common opinion, but by its covenant, that is, by a common purpose.

I draw no moral from these two incidents in my own experience. I tell the story, and leave the story to carry its own moral. My Unknown Friends, however, will not perhaps be surprised to know that these experiences have had their effect upon me and have strengthened my conviction that the true bond of unity of a church is not a common opinion but a common purpose and a common spirit.

LYMAN ABBOTT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. MORGAN AND THE "MONEY TRUST"

A POLL OF THE PRESS

IT was once said in Wall Street that no man could borrow a million dollars in New York City if John Pierpont Morgan decided that he should not have the money. This statement is probably an exaggeration, thinks the New York "World," but "it illustrates a condition of things beyond denial. The sole purpose of all these combinations is to control credit through the control of money, and whoever is master of credit is master of the commerce and industry of a nation."

Accordingly, last week Mr. Morgan, as supposedly the most powerful person in the world of finance, was the most prominent witness before the Congressional Committee at Washington which is investigating the question, "Is there a Money Trust?"

Mr. Morgan talked frankly, says the correspondent of the New York "American," who adds:

He answered all questions put to him and seemed to hunger for more. He made epigrams. He laughed. . . . At times, when replies that Mr. Morgan did not in the least intend to be funny aroused the audience to mirth, his red face would grow purple. Then he would swing around on his pivoted chair and observe "ha, ha," as solemnly as if he were mentioning a vast sum of money.

Sometimes he went through the motions of laughter without uttering a sound, his mouth opening and closing rhythmically under the great gray mustache that sweeps his heavy jowl. . . . Driven hard by Samuel Untermyer, who was without awe in the presence of the big game he was stalking, Mr. Morgan was at times cynical, again jocose, anon enthusiastic. But never for a minute did he forget that he was there to talk for the institutions he has helped to build up, and manifestly to resent any imputation that any of them are founded upon the sands of speculation.

Incidentally he gave the listening Congressmen and spectators more light on the point of view of big business than had ever before been shed upon their bewildered minds.

Mr. Morgan was accompanied by his legal counsel, who were described by the New York "World" as follows:

Mr. Morgan went to Washington accompanied by Joseph H. Choate, former Ambassador to Great Britain and the leader of the New York bar; by John C. Spooner, former United States Senator from Wisconsin and now a distinguished New York lawyer; by Francis Lynde Stetson, one of the ablest corporation lawyers in the country; by R. V. Lindabury, the general counsel for the Pennsylvania Railroad Company; by DeLancey Nicoll, who was the attorney for the Tobacco Trust in the recent dissolution proceedings; by William F. Sheehan, who was a candidate for United States Senator in New York and is one of the best-known corporation lawyers in the city.

Commenting on this, the Sioux Falls, South Dakota, "Press" says:

J. Pierpont Morgan is perhaps as unpopular in the public eye as any money baron in the history of America, and this despite the fact that he has ever been a willing and unostentatious contributor to charity as well as a powerful factor in the development of art in this country. The reason for his unpopularity is plain. Give him all credit for the good he has done and there still remain many indictments against him for steadfast refusal to do a greater good. Lest he involuntarily or accidentally contribute information of value to the whole country, he protects himself with a squad of legal sentries.

As to the combination of personality and testimony, the Washington "Times" speaks as follows:

History closed one chapter and opened another in our American story when John Pierpont Morgan appeared before the House Committee to talk about money this week. There was a quality of drama in the episode; it was free from climax, but none the less vivid for that freedom. Somehow it was a thing that could have happened only in America, and Mr. Morgan emerges from it as even a larger figure than he was before.

By the tally of the years he is an old man; by the proof he has just given he is still the master of his thoughts, and his thoughts encompass many things. He has lived a large and a mighty life; he has seen from the inside the making of great history; he has grown as his country has grown, and the spread of his name and his power have kept pace with the march of ours. . . .

He has done some almost supreme things for art. His gifts to charity have been of the splendid kind. He has built racing yachts and endowed polite learning.

There have been times when his word was a rule of law to three continents. The terms of wealth in which he thinks are beyond the grasp of common minds. . . .

His schemes have been ambitious beyond the dreams of wealth, too big at times to please a people resentful of intrenched authority.

The Chicago "Evening Post" says:

After his testimony of yesterday the country will, we believe, have a finer feeling toward Mr. Morgan. He talked like a statesman. There was in his testimony no touch of the stock gambler, no suggestion of that ratlike cunning that has marred similar interviews with men who probably have greater fortunes than he. It was all done so quietly, too. In its perfect matter-of-factness, its taking it all for granted, it outweighed the explosives of Tom Lawson or the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"big business" novel such as David Graham Phillips used to give us.

For our own part we are willing to say that, if we must have a financial master, we are glad that J. Pierpont Morgan is that master; but we are opposed by tradition and belief to having a master of any kind.

WHAT IS THE GREATEST TRUST POWER?

Of all trusts, the most powerful is the Morgan Money Trust, declares the Louisville "Post." "It is made up of steel mills, ore beds, coal mines, banks, insurance companies and trust companies, newspapers, distilleries, flour mills, car works, locomotive works, railroads, ships, docks and terminals—all constituting a financial oligarchy such as the world has never seen." The paper gives details:

J. P. Morgan & Co. and George F. Baker jointly control the Bankers' and the Guaranty Trust Companies through voting trusts, and George F. Baker controls the First National Bank of New York. Morgan and Baker have been close allies many years. These four institutions, that is to say these two men, are represented in the directorates of 112 corporations with resources of $32,245,000,000. They have 341 directors to do their bidding in these directorates. They have 118 directors in thirty-four bank and trust companies with resources of $2,679,000,000 and deposits of $1,982,000,000; thirty directors in ten insurance companies with assets of $2,293,000,000; 105 directors in 32 transportation systems with capital of $11,184,000,000 and 150,000 miles of railway tracks, which is about three-fifths of all the railway mileage in the United States, not to mention the steamship combination and smaller steamship companies and two express companies; 63 directors in twenty-four industrial and commercial corporations with capital of $3,339,000,000; 25 directors of twelve public utility corporations with capital of $2,150,000,000.

Fourteen other banks and trust companies and banking firms, of which Boston and Chicago each claim two, the remainder being in New York, were deemed worthy of a place beside these in a chart made for the Pujo Committee to illustrate the concentration of banking power in this country. Among these is the National City Bank of New York, dominated by the Standard Oil magnates. The eighteen have 746 directors in 134 corporations with resources of nearly twenty-six billions of dollars.

If this chart is correct, the question whether there is a money trust has been answered.

Mr. Morgan's testimony interested the Springfield, Massachusetts, "Union" mainly on account of the views expressed on the matters treated, not because of the information supplied. As to the latter the paper says:

Generally speaking, he believes in maintaining the existing order. He has scant faith in attempts to reform the stock exchange, and would resist any attempt to hamper private control of business. He likes a little competition, but he likes combination better. He defends "selling short," but says "manipulation is always bad," which latter is a rather striking admission, since many operators uphold manipulation.

Regarding Mr. Morgan's point of view, the Topeka "Capital" declares:

Mr. Morgan is known by his "fruits" to be building up as fast as the brevity of life permits a huge and unprecedented control of transportation, industrial, and credit institutions and enterprises. To ask him whether he is doing so, or whether he believes in that sort of thing, seems a waste of time, if time has any value at Washington. Mr. Morgan's time at least supposedly has value, and he wasted about a week of it in order to make side-stepping responses to a lot of foolish questions.

The Louisville "Post" also says:

In his two days' examination little was revealed that was not known before. Supported by his legal lackeys, Mr. Morgan concealed what he did not care to have known, and revealed only those things of no real importance.

The Louisville paper adds:

But in these public declarations of this head of a gigantic and remorseless Money Power we must see within the Government a power greater than the Government itself.

In no country has ever the one-man power been developed to such gigantic proportions.

It is impossible, says Mr. Morgan, to control all the money. He does better; he controls all the organized agencies for distributing the wealth other men create.

A similar point of view is taken by the Cedar Rapids "Gazette:"

J. P. Morgan says there can be no money trust. But he might admit that certain individuals, controlling a great deal of wealth, can merge their forces and make it very difficult for other people to get very much money for business enterprises. There are enough people who disagree with Morgan to start a discussion and make an interesting joint debate.

THE BANKS

After it was shown that the private banking house of J. P. Morgan & Co. had above seventy millions of deposits from big corporations, says the Topeka "Capital," "Mr. Untermyer could not induce Mr. Morgan on the stand to admit that it is undesirable from a public point of view to permit great corporations to make their deposits with private bankers who are not under Federal supervision." The paper adds:

Mr. Morgan explained his position. He believed that it depended on the character of the banker, and that it is a matter to be left to the directors of the corporations.

Mr. Untermyer had already shown that the directors are picked by J. P. Morgan, so that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their subsequent action in preferring to make the deposits with the bank of J. P. Morgan is natural. Should they prefer some other banker, some other directors would probably succeed them on the directorate.

Mr. Morgan runs counter to public sentiment, affirms the Tacoma "Tribune," "when he declares that in his opinion the private banks should be allowed to do as they please with the funds intrusted to them and that the Government should not attempt to exercise control of these banks. Therein lies the milk in the cocoanut and the African in the woodpile."

The Buffalo "News" has another point of view:

Mr. Morgan states that the deposits in his own banking house run about a hundred millions on the average and that about seventy-one millions of that amount is the total deposits of no more than sixty-eight persons. Those sixty-eight persons are not hoodwinked, deceived, or cheated into depositing with Morgan & Co., neither are they compelled to leave their money there one minute if they do not wish to.

In a word, while every sort of emphasis is laid upon the influence that a man of good reputation in finance may exert, through his abilities, nothing is said of the eagerness that the uncounted thousands of persons put their money where it may be under the guidance and direction of such a master mind, and do it gladly.

If one is going to annihilate the so-called Money Trust, the annihilation might as well begin with persuading depositors to scatter their money into small institutions where little can be done with it, and therefore little earned and small return be received.

COMPETITION AND COMBINATION

Regarding Mr. Morgan's emphasis on control, his advocacy of combination, and his views deprecating Governmental interference, the Springfield, Massachusetts, "Union" puts this question:

Why does Mr. Morgan believe in combination? Logically, because it furthers the power of control he deems all-important. But when he speaks of control does he mean a kind of control that is exclusive of the matter of credit? If so, the control must be weak and ineffectual in many emergencies, since credit is such a huge factor in modern business.

Now, when we take Mr. Morgan's utterances in respect to combination and competition, and the right of private capital to wield unfettered control within a given domain of operations, and study them in the light of common sense and a knowledge of the trend of business, we have some highly interesting testimony bearing on the question of the control of credit, or a "money trust." Mr. Morgan says that combination has proved a very effective measure when used by the right kind of men, and doubtless he would agree that it is a harmful thing when applied by the wrong kind of men. But he declares there can be no money trust because "money cannot be cornered." It is a fair question, though, if combination in finance may not be carried far enough to constitute a decidedly dangerous thing in respect to the control of credit.

Nevertheless, according to the Buffalo "Express," we must admit the following fact:

It happens that under the system or combination or whatever it may be called which has been developed in the financial world through the Morgan influence there has come a solidity and stability in railroad and industrial finance which has been very beneficial. Whether there would be such stability under highly competitive conditions may well be doubted.

CHARACTER

We extract some of Mr. Untermyer's questions to Mr. Morgan about control of banks:

Mr. Untermyer—Suppose you owned all the banks, or controlled them, and somebody wanted to start up in the steel business against the United States Steel Corporation, and wanted a vast amount of capital, New York would be the natural market for money?

Mr. Morgan—Yes.

Mr. Untermyer—If you controlled all those banks and a competitor, or a potential competitor, came along, and it was a good business proposition, would he get the money from those banks you control?

Mr. Morgan—Yes, he would.

Mr. Untermyer—Some other man who might control might not take the view you have.

Mr. Morgan—He would not have the control.

Mr. Untermyer—Assuming that you had it, your idea is that when a man abuses it he loses it?

Mr. Morgan—Yes; and he never gets it back again, either. What I mean is this: The question of control, in this country at least, is personal; that is, in money.

Mr. Untermyer—If you had the control of all that represents the assets in the banks of New York, you would have the control of money, of all that money?

Mr. Morgan—No, you would not.

Mr. Untermyer—If a man controlled the credit of a country, he would have control of all its affairs?

Mr. Morgan—He might have that view, but he would not have the money. If he had the credit and I had the money, his customer would be badly off. Money cannot be controlled. Many men have great credit who have no money.

Mr. Untermyer—Is not that because it is believed that they have money back of them?

Mr. Morgan—No, sir; it is because people believe in the man. I have known a man to come into my office, and I have given him a check for $1,000,000 when I knew he had not a cent in the world.

Why did Mr. Morgan, knowing that that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man had nothing, hand over to him his check for $1,000,000? asks the Chicago "Inter Ocean," and replies:

The answer is simple. He knew the man. The man had an idea of some kind worth backing. Mr. Morgan did what is done every day in the business world. Of course it is not often done on so large a scale, but the principle is the same.

With the real masters of business it is invariably the man who counts first and most.

The stress laid by Mr. Morgan on character as a basis of credit seemed to surprise Mr. Untermyer, says the Springfield "Union." Character, said Mr. Morgan, will enable a man to borrow a million dollars on credit without showing a cent of assets, and there are many men who enjoy that advantage. The paper adds:

By character Mr. Morgan evidently means honesty and ability; it cannot be that he means honesty alone. But is it not fair to assume that Mr. Morgan has in mind something else, too, in this connection—the character of a man as a force for or against the principles and policies that Mr. Morgan conceives as operating for the welfare of finance? . . .

"A man I do not trust," says Mr. Morgan, "could not get money from me on all the bonds in Christendom."

And again: "If a man comes in and I see there is a loan to Mr. Smith, I say, 'You call that loan right away. I would not have that loan in the box.'" Mr. Morgan, then, believes in character loans, and he believes in denying loans to men who do not, in his estimation, possess character.

UNCLE SAM AND STATE LIQUOR LAWS

A REVIEW

IN attempting to enforce laws for the regulation or the suppression of the sale of liquor, the advocates of such laws have often complained that they are obstructed and hindered, and not infrequently thwarted, by the Federal Government. Repeatedly they have submitted to Congress bills to relieve the States from what they regard as unjust interference on the part of the Federal Government with the efforts of the States to deal with the liquor question as those States see fit.

For example, Maine has a law, buttressed by a Constitutional provison, forbidding within the State the manufacture or sale of liquor. If a man living in Portland ships liquor from that city to Skowhegan, the liquor is subject to the law of the State from the time it leaves Portland. It is subject to search and seizure on the route. Of course, though the liquor may be seized, if it is not intended for sale it is not confiscated; but it is within the power of the courts to inquire into the intent of the one to whom that liquor is shipped. If the court decides that the one to whom it is addressed intended to sell it in violation of the law, then the liquor is outlawed. In case, however, some one in a place just over the State line, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, for instance, ships liquor to the same person in Skowhegan, and the Maine authorities attempt search and seizure while the liquor is on the route, even after it has passed the State line and is within the State of Maine, the Federal court can be invoked to interfere and prevent such search and seizure until the liquor comes into the possession of the person to whom it is addressed. The recipient may be a stranger in Skowhegan. He may be intending surreptitiously to sell this liquor to the boys of the place. He goes to the railway station and finds a local official or detective watching the case. He may boast openly before that official that he intends to use the liquor for the violation of the law, and yet neither he nor the liquor itself can be proceeded against. He may then watch his chance and get the liquor while an official is not on watch and put it in hiding. The effort of the local authorities of Skowhegan, clothed with power by the law of the State, is thus obstructed and possibly thwarted altogether by the power of the Federal Government.

It is to meet such a situation as this that the various measures relating to inter-State commerce in liquor have been from time to time introduced into Congress. One measure tending to relieve this situation has already been enacted into law. According to this act the original package containing the liquor must be plainly marked on the outside so that its contents may be known. This law is an aid in so far as it enables officials to recognize a package containing liquor, but it does not do anything to relieve Uncle Sam from the charge of standing guard over goods outlawed by a State. Up to this time no bill with this as its clear purpose has made much headway

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Congress. As a rule, such bills have been quietly allowed to smother in committee.

Now at last, however, there is such a bill which has passed the committee stage and is before Congress itself. It is a bill called by the names of the introducers of it into the House and Senate respectively—the Sheppard-Kenyon Bill. As it has been reported to the Senate, it contains two provisions. The first prohibits transportation in inter-State commerce of liquor into any State if it can be shown that that liquor is to be used in violation of the law of that State. The second provides that such liquor, if transported into and remaining in a State, shall upon the arrival within its boundaries and before delivery to the consignee be subjected to the laws of that State enacted in the exercise of its reserved police powers, just as if that liquor had been produced within the State.

During the course of hearings on this bill there were many arguments offered pro and con. A great deal of the argument was devoted, on the one side, to expressions strongly favorable to prohibitory laws, and on the other side to expressions strongly favorable to that view of personal liberty that opposes prohibitory laws. Of course neither of these arguments were really pertinent to the bill. The real question is not whether State prohibition laws are desirable, but whether, even if they are not desirable, the Federal Government should or can refrain from interference with the enforcement of those laws.

This is practically a Constitutional question. Of course there are some so strongly opposed to prohibition that they desire the Federal Government to do all that it Constitutionally can to enable people to traffic in liquor even within prohibition States. Such people, even if they conceded the Constitutional right of Congress to refrain from interfering with such laws, would argue that the Federal Government ought to continue to interfere so as to minimize what they regard as the evils created by the prohibition laws of the States. For the most part, however, the real objection directed against this bill is that it purports to do that which Congress has no Constitutional right to do. Briefly stated, the argument against the bill is that it delegates to the States powers which rightfully can be exercised only by Congress; that it substitutes the will of a State for the will of the Federal Government in the regulation of inter-State commerce. Court decisions have been cited showing that although early in the life of the Nation it was held that States could regulate inter-State commerce in the absence of action by Congress, it is now an accepted Constitutional principle that, in the absence of National regulation of inter-State commerce, there is no regulation at all. Those who argue against the bill concede that Congress can adopt a State law as its own, but that it can do so only with regard to State laws already in existence, and that it cannot give the State Legislatures power of attorney to enact laws instead of Congress for the future.

On the other hand, the argument for the Constitutionality of the law may be briefly put as follows: Congress has full power over inter-State commerce; it has the power to prohibit inter-State commerce in single articles, as, for example, lottery tickets; it has the same power over inter-State commerce that it has over foreign commerce; the same power over inter-State commerce that a Legislature has over commerce within the State. The greater power includes the less. If it can prohibit inter-State commerce in a single article under all circumstances, it can also prohibit inter-State commerce in an article under such circumstances as it may designate. In fact, Congress has already done so in passing the Lacey Game Act, by which it is made unlawful for any person to transport into any State game which has been killed or shipped in violation of the laws of the State in which it was killed or from which it was shipped. It is furthermore pointed out that the Supreme Court has explicitly declared that the regulation of pilots, which is a National matter, may be subjected to the laws of the several States. Still further, it is pointed out that since Congress has the same power over commerce between the States that it has over foreign commerce, and since it has, by a minimum and maximum tariff arrangement, made the regulation of foreign commerce dependent upon the action of foreign countries, so it can make the regulation of inter-State commerce dependent upon the action of the several States. The bill does not provide any penalty because it does not need to do so. All that it does is to allow liquor transported from one State into another to be subjected to the processes and the penalties of the laws of the State into which it goes. It has been cited as a legal principle that the intent to violate the laws of the State impresses upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the thing, which is possessed with a view to such a violation, the character of a nuisance.

The Outlook believes that there is a more effective way of controlling and suppressing the evils of the liquor traffic than State prohibition; but the merits of prohibition are not here involved. What is involved is the right of the State to exercise its own judgment as to how it shall deal with the liquor traffic. It seems but reasonable that the Federal Government should not unnecessarily interfere with the State in carrying out its own will in this respect, and whatever Congress can do to enable the State to enforce its own laws, Congress ought to do. The powers of Congress over inter-State commerce have very few limitations. It ought to exercise that power in co-operation with the States.

WAR-TIME GLIMPSES FROM THE EAST

THE two following letters were written to a friend in America, the first by a lady residing in Constantinople, the second by a Bulgarian young man in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria. The Arnaoutkeny School mentioned by the first writer is a school for girls in Constantinople which prepares them for the Girls' College. Both the Girls' College and the preparatory school have been in Scutari, on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, opposite Constantinople. Comparatively recently land has been bought in Constantinople and the school has been moved, and the college is to be moved as soon as the buildings now in process of construction are completed. Mr. Rockhill, the American Ambassador, counseled Miss Patrick, the President of the college, to bring over the college girls to Constantinople to the Arnaoutkeny School, as a means of protection from possible danger. Miss Patrick complied with his request, but was unwilling to leave the college buildings unprotected, and with one companion remained in them.

Roumelie, Hisson,
November 20, 1911.

Dear H——:

The Scorpion is stationed in front of the Arnaoutkeny School, and nine of its marines have come to the College with their firearms. So far everything is quiet. Since Saturday afternoon we have heard the constant firing near Tchataldja, but this morning it is quiet. We have been told that when we hear three sharp cannon shots in quick succession it means to pick up our light baggage and go to whatever place of safety is provided for each nationality. You would laugh to see my room, it looks like a refugee's, for trying to make the packages light of weight. I have done them up in boghdgas and calico bags, and the provisions in strong bags—as we are to take two days' supplies with us. . . . I was told yesterday that the three strokes of cannon would mean that the bridges had not been opened according to order and the warships were going to blow them up and we should know the Government had lost control and the foreigners must look out for themselves If only the allies do not enter the city there will be no trouble. It is the maddened, retreating army we fear joined to the rabble. But with all these precautions I do not think our lives are in danger. I shall regret leaving the house, for I can take comparatively little with me, and if the soldiers did not discover the house our dear neighbors, the Dervishes, would have a nice time looting. Catherine has just come this minute to say that eight or ten Red Crescent men just went dashing down the hill and then stopped at the fork here, discussing. We wonder if they are bringing in the wounded over the hill. S. is nursing in the Gulhane hospital and has had some terrible cases there, but she says they are all so grateful. She is a very gentle person, and she says it makes her quiver to see how rough some of the nurses are. One of her soldiers said to her, "If I get well I am going to tell my wife to weave you a rug so thick," showing about 1½ in. on his finger. And another said, "I have a house in Broosa, and if I get well I shall sell it and give you a nice present." These were not officers but just privates.

Hotel Bristol, Sofia,
November 11, 1912.

Dear B——:

Here I am in Sofia! I got here Saturday morning at half-past four in a pretty nearly dead condition!

But to begin farther back, as I know all the news I can give you will be received with avidity. We spent the night in Bucharest near the station, but there was very little sleep for the righteous! I refused even to

DRURY COLLEGE LIBRARY
Springfield, Missouri
PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try my bed, so I took two chairs and set them about four feet apart and then put two of our bags, one on top of the other, between. It was anything but comfortable, as every time I moved the bags threatened to collapse and the chairs to slide in opposite directions. However, I managed to sleep four hours on this "bed of torture." From Bucharest we took the train to Gringevo and crossed the Danube in a little steamer to Rustchuk. There we were received with great respect and honor as coming from Constantinople! We spent the night there, and the next morning drove to the station in pitch darkness at 4:20 to take the train for Sofia. When we got there we found that the train would not leave for another two hours. So we had to settle down in the station and try and look happy on empty stomachs. There was a convenience called a "buffet de la gare," but that was all—not even the pretense of anything to eat! Three Russian aviators traveled from Rustchuk with us; they are going as volunteers, paying their own expenses, to the Bulgarian front. As two of them spoke German and French, I got on famously. I would not care to be in their shoes, as one of the Bulgarian officers has already been burned up along with his machine while making a reconnaissance over Adrianople.

At a place called Orahovitza we had to change trains and wait three hours. Fortunately, the "buffet" there deserved its name, and we were able to get something warm to eat at last. There we saw for the first time wounded soldiers from the front on their way to their homes. The one thing that seemed to bother them was that they had been wounded so early in the war and had not had a chance to kill a few more of the dogs, as they call the Turks.

About three o'clock we started off again, and as there was no place anywhere else we traveled in grand style, first-class. We reached Sofia at half-past four in the morning, and one of the boys who was with me found his father in military uniform in command of the station. I have been examined and will be placed either in the Royal Guard Regiment or the cavalry. After three weeks or so we are probably to be sent as an army of occupation of the new territories for a month or so, to guard the towns and chase stray bands of Turkish deserters that have taken to the hills.

One sees slightly wounded soldiers on all sides here in the streets. Most of them are wounded in the left foot or the left hand. The wounds for the most part seem to be slight, as the Turkish bullets are small and pointed, thereby making a clean cut without doing much damage.

The Turkish prisoners here are well looked after, being given clothing, food, and tobacco, but all the same they are terribly afraid that they will be massacred, as their officers told them that the Christians would kill any of them who became prisoners. Some of them refuse all food and medicine for fear of being poisoned. A wounded Turkish officer died this morning of starvation because he refused all food, and several soldiers have died for the same reason. The nurses have to taste the medicines and food of many of them before they will touch them.

Some of the wounded Turkish officers treat in a most brutal manner the ladies who bring them flowers. The Hungarian doctors are the only ones whom they allow to come near them. There have also been several fights between the wounded Bulgars and Turks in the hospitals, so they have been placed in separate wards. A Bulgarian in one of the hospitals recognized the Turk lying next to him as being the one who had advanced under the white flag and had tried to get the Bulgarian's company into an ambush, whereupon he sprang out of his bed, although he had four wounds in his leg, and before they could control him he had pretty nearly strangled the Turk. In another ward a Turk jabbed a Bulgarian in the side and said, "Give me a cigarette, Giaour," whereupon three of the most severely wounded in the room leaped upon him and thrashed the Turk in a more sound fashion than three unwounded men could have done!

I have seen some of the prisoners marching through the streets—a miserable-looking lot of men without overcoats and shoes, for the most part; a number of them dressed in officers' clothes that they had evidently stolen, and the Christians with hats and caps on their heads to distinguish them from the Turks. The wounded from the front bring the most terrible tales of Turkish cruelty on men, women, and children.

A girl who is acting as a nurse in one of the hospitals here during the day tells me that she has not heard a single groan from the patients, although some of them are quite severely wounded. She says it is all she can do to keep them in bed, as they are so anxious to be off to the front again. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Greek Meets Turk

BY ALBERT EDWARDS

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT OF THE OUTLOOK IN THE BALKANS

Mr. Edwards in this second article of his Outlook correspondence from the Balkans gives us the point of view of the Greeks as he found it in Athens. From Athens he went directly to Constantinople, and the third article will present his observations in the Turkish capital, while a fourth article will probably be written in Sofia and will report the attitude of victorious Bulgaria.—THE EDITORS.

IN my last article I referred to the nationalist spirit which has grown up among the Christian peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. It is the nubbin of the present situation. Nowhere is this development more clearly shown than in Greece.

The other day I was sitting before a café in the Constitution Square in Athens. Among the passers-by there were relatively few men in civilian clothes. There were officers of the État Major and the Commissary, and a group of very German Gretchens with the Red Cross on their sleeves; but most were soldiers—from the awkward way they carried their uniforms, they were evidently "reservists" recently called to arms.

Among the throng one figure attracted my attention—a wounded soldier. His uniform showed the marks of hard service. One foot was wrapped in immense bandages. He hobbled along uncertainly; the crutches were new to him. He was grumbling audibly as he approached, and as he came opposite me he had apparently run out of Greek expletives, for I heard an explosive "damn."

"You speak English?" I asked.

"Sure," he replied.

I offered him some liquid comfort, and he sat down beside me. He had lived eight years in the States, where he had left a wife and three children. He kept a shoe-shining parlor and news-stand in his home town. He said he read The Outlook regularly. He also had the monopoly of boot-blacking in the Federal Building, the Court-House, and two large hotels. He employed twenty-five of his countrymen. He owned a house with a lawn, and had left several thousand dollars in the bank.

When the news of the war reached him he had bought passage home for all his employees who were old enough to serve, and had come himself. They had reached Greece in time to join the Crown Prince's army in Thessaly, and had entered Salonika in triumph.

"Are you going to stay here in Greece?" I asked.

"Oh, no," he said. "I will go back as soon as I am discharged. I cannot fight any more. I am an American citizen."

"Well," I said, "you've had hard luck. No wonder you swear."

"I was not swearing at my luck. It is not much to be lame for one's country. It is at these crutches I swear. This is my first day out of the hospital. It is hard to walk on them."

There are more than thirty thousand men in the Greek army who have come from America for the war. On the ship which brought me to Piræus there was one from Alaska and another from the Transvaal. When I told this to my wounded friend he was pleased but not surprised.

"Of course," he said. "A man never forgets his country. It is the same with our women. My wife—she was born in Smyrna—would have hated me if I had not come."

The Greeks were the first of the Balkan peoples to gain their freedom. After ten years of desperate fighting the independence of a part of Greece was recognized by the Powers. For eighty years now they have been their own masters. Out of scattered bands of guerrilla warriors, out of a population abjectly poor and ignorant and habituated to serfdom, they have made a nation.

The story of Rip Van Winkle, who fell asleep for twenty years, is one of the choicest bits of our humor. Greece had slept for twenty centuries. In their sudden freedom from the long slavery to Macedonia, to Rome,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Byzantium and Constantinople, in their effort to accommodate themselves to nineteenth-century conditions, the Greeks furnished much material for merriment. The memoirs of Edmond About, who was connected with the French Archæological Mission during the reign of the first king, Otto, give many ludicrous accounts of Athenian society and of the wild gesticulations of "the Patriots." Ten years of guerrilla warfare with the Turks was not the best transition imaginable from abject slavery to democratic liberty. The efforts of the first generation of "Patriots" at self-government were often laughable. Chiefs of mountain clans, whom it would have been hard to distinguish from brigands, carried themselves like emperors—and, it must be admitted, often acted like leaders of Tammany Hall. Political life was stormy in the first flush of liberty.

This letter, which I find quoted in Gaston Deschamps's "La Grèce d'aujourd'hui," gives a picture of campaign activity and also of the direct and personal relations which "the Patriots" maintained with their King:

"*Sire:*—

"The brigand Tsoulis—an electoral agent of Panaghopoulo, the Ministry's candidate for Mayor—knowing that an election was to take place in Almyro, came with four accomplices and dragged into the mountains Constantine Siamétis, Athanasius Siamétis, Basile Episcopus, Christos Dinos, Constantine Konyiouni, Constantine Loritis, and Dimitri Siamétis. A few days before, he had taken prisoner Georges Zikos. These unfortunates, all from the village of Karakatzana, are my political friends. They were going to vote for me! The brigand did not let them go until he had received word that my rival, Panaghopoulo, was elected."

He goes on to tell how "the same brigand" threatened to massacre the flocks and families of ten shepherds if they voted for him. "So I was cheated out of their votes; and, if I add those of my friends named above, that makes 18 votes. And Panaghopoulo beat me by only 13!

"I declare this election illegal and void.

"I have the honor to be, Sire, the unfortunate candidate of the opposition in the municipal elections of Almyro.

"TRIANDOPHYLLOS ARGHYROPOULO."

Still more amusing material has been furnished to foreign observers by the question of language. During the centuries of oppression the purity of the Greek of Demosthenes had been lost. Every passing race of conquerors had left its impress on the speech of these downtrodden people. Many of the old intricate grammatical forms had been lost. Latin, Venetian, French, and Turkish roots had been absorbed. The philologists call this patois "Romanic."

The Patriots who assembled under the shadow of the Acropolis to re-establish "the glory that was Greece" decreed the abolition of this jargon of serfdom. The classic language—which modern science is gradually crowding out of our college courses at home—was to be arbitrarily revived. The Hellenists have succeeded to a remarkable extent, especially in geography. Towns and rivers and mountains are now called by the old names, which the people had forgotten for many centuries. Socrates could find his way about with the maps of the État Major. Most of the newspapers are partisans of this revival, and every year their editorials more nearly approach the grammatical form, if not the style, of Thucydides.

But, unfortunately for the lover of ancient phrases, new things have come into the world. Where in a dictionary of classic Greek can one find a word for "street car"? The purists have manufactured this monstrosity: "*hipposiderodromas.*" The cannons with which the Greeks are to-day chastising the Turk are "*telebolos.*" Their revolvers are "*polykroton.*" The elevator in my hotel is labeled "*aneakusthra.*" The lexicographers of ancient Athens never dreamed of such things as corsets or trousers. The modern Hellenist grammarians have invented "*stethodesmos*" and "*periskelis*"—literally "that which binds the chest" and "that which encircles the leg."

Happily, the common people refuse to be cultured up to the level of such absurdities.

The grandiose dreams of the newly liberated Greeks caused much amusement to those writers who have left memoirs of the early days. At first the young nation was in a very bad way to pay its debts. A Frenchman urged on one of the Patriots the desirability of putting their financial house in order.

"Oh," was the reply, "it will be time enough to think about that when we have captured Constantinople and re-established the Greek Empire."

But even in the first and stormiest days some observers were able to see below these surface absurdities. The political disturb-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ances were only the effervescence of a fervid if unpracticed passion for liberty. The amusing pedantry of the Neo-Hellenist grammarians was only an exuberance of their veneration for the work and words of the ancient Greeks who civilized Europe. Despite its extravagances it showed a profound preoccupation in the knowledge which the Greeks, first of all mankind, discovered to be synonymous with Power. The grandiose ambition to recreate an empire was a sign that the half-fledged little nation had hitched its wagon to a star.

After erecting a palace for their King, the first thing the new nation did was to build a university. Of the $150,000 which represented its first cost, more than half came from Greeks who were still subject to the Sultan.

Capo d'Istria, the statesman who was to Greece what Cavour later was to Italy and Bismarck to Germany, one time defined his nation in these words, which have been treasured by all his people:

"The Greek nation is composed of the men who, since the fall of Constantinople, have not ceased to profess the Orthodox Religion nor to speak the language of their fathers, and who have remained under the spiritual and temporal jurisdiction of their Church—no matter what country they inhabit."

The wounded soldier from our Middle West with whom I talked in Constitution Square, the two I found in the steerage, from the Klondike and Cape Town, and the thirty thousand others who have come home to fight, prove how true was the grandiloquent definition of d'Istria.

The University is the center of the national spirit which unites the people "no matter what country they inhabit." The criticism is sometimes made that as an institution for "higher education" it is not on a par with its prototypes of western Europe. That is not what it was built for. One might as well criticise a sewing-machine for not flying. The thousands of dollars which came from Turkey and Egypt and India and America for its building, the constant stream of gifts which flowed in from all corners of the world, were and are inspired by the determination to keep alive the national spirit of Greece. The various branches of pure science are mentioned in its curriculum. But the overwhelming interest of the faculty is to teach the two thousand odd students the lessons of patriotism.

Even if the University is not so profoundly erudite as might be wished, no such pedagogical criticism can be brought against the lower schools. Eighty years ago there was no such thing as public education. Now it is free and compulsory. More impressive to me than any amount of statistics is the fact that to-day there is no worse reproach, no insult so surely resented, as the word "illiterate."

This new national spirit has also accomplished a result which such statesman as Pericles failed of. It has united Greece. The little valleys which in the Golden Age each sheltered a tiny, separatist republic have been united by roads and telegraphs and rails. The modern Spartan reads the morning paper printed in Athens. The fatal disunion of the old days is gone. The Greek nation is a unit.

Out of the political turmoil of the early days has grown an orderly government as democratic as that of England, a government which, when faced by the extraordinary crisis of a great war, has met the strain calmly and efficiently. The Greek commissary work is such as to bring a blush to any American who recalls the chaos and scandals of our little Spanish War. It must have the same effect on Englishmen who remember South Africa.

A few days ago the General Staff here at Athens received a telegram from Belgrade. On account of the horrible weather and almost impassable roads, the Serbs were finding it difficult to provision their troops on the Adriatic between Alessio and Durazzo. King Carlos asked if the Greeks could help. Within twelve hours after the receipt of this despatch a Greek ship, loaded down with commissary stores, left Patras. In ten hours more the hungry Servian soldiers were eating Greek rations. Bulgarian soldiers are also being transported by the Greek boats from Salonika to their headquarters before Constantinople. All this speaks of a higher degree of organizing and executive ability than we ordinarily associate with democracy.

You hear a great deal—from modern classicists—about the decadence of Greece. Certainly the Royal Palace is hideous. The lines of the University cannot compare with those of the Parthenon. And neither Homer nor Euripides is writing for the local papers.

But the other day my attention was caught by a little village, as the train stopped at its station. It was brand-new. There was a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

factory of some kind, and perhaps three hundred houses. The name which the conductor called did not suggest the ancient glory. It was not Marathon nor Parnassus. The place took its name from the factory-owner—as prosaic as Higginsville. But those three hundred houses were well built, if ugly. The school was prominent, and looked airy and modern. The villagers were not very picturesque in their "European" clothes, but they were clean and carried their heads like free people.

Until democracy develops a new art, there will be less beauty in the world than in the old days, but there will be more places like this little Grecian Higginsville. It could not have existed in the Golden Age. There would have been in place of it an exquisite villa surrounded by the hovels of slaves. If Pericles were reborn to-day in modern Greece, he could not find the bondsmen he would need to drag his marbles up that precipitous hill, if he wished to rebuild the Acropolis.

That little village, with its unadorned cubes of houses, with vegetable gardens around them, with the big school-house, and the upright way the men and women walk, is more truly civilized, I think, than the Republic of Plato was. Fortunately, the industrial development of the country has been somewhat retarded, and so the modern Greeks can avoid the orgy of unchecked individualism which has given us our slums and our hideous factory towns. Some of our captains of industry would find themselves as much hampered by the free democracy of modern Greece as Pericles would have been by the lack of slaves.

Such are the positive achievements of the spirit of nationalism. A country of serfs has become free; a coherent, democratic government has been established, and the foundations are wisely laid for the development of industry along the lines of national welfare.

But Greek nationalism has had a darker and more sinister aspect. Side by side with the ardent aspirations for liberty and human dignity there has been—perhaps inevitably—the narrowest provincialism. Pan-Hellenism has come in contact, bloody contact, with the growing spirit of nationalism among the other Balkan peoples. It is a sordid, heartrending story, but the wounds of the conflict between Greeks and Slavs have been too deep to be ignored.

The reign of turmoil and bloodshed in Macedonia has been called "a quarrel of monks." The immediate cause was an ecclesiastical struggle as barren as the ancient warfare of prelates over "the vowel or the diphthong."

The Turks, when they overthrew the Byzantian Empire in the fifteenth century, following the Mohammedan custom, did not recognize the nationalities of the people they conquered, but only their religions. Even to-day the Turks refer to all followers of the Orthodox Church as "Greeks," to Catholics and Protestants as "Franks." The official head of each Church represents his flock in temporal as well as in spiritual matters. The Sultan, from an administrative point of view, makes no distinction between Bulgars, Serbs, and the Hellenic people—they are all "Greeks."

This condition does not seem to have raised any serious protest until recent times. But during the last fifty years there is little doubt that the Orthodox Patriarch at Constantinople became a partisan of Greek nationalism. He appointed Greek bishops to dioceses where the population was overwhelmingly Slavonic. The schools of the Church in Turkey taught only the Greek language. The same spirit of nationalism which was regenerating Greece was at work among the Slavs. Bulgars and Serbs were also digging up traditions, relearning forgotten songs and folk-customs, and reviving their languages. Inevitably they resented the Pan-Hellenism of their Church. They demanded instruction in their mother tongues.

Joachim III, the Patriarch who has just died, was a narrow-minded partisan, as bitter against the aspirations of the Slavic members of his flock as the present Pope is against Modernism. He was more influenced by the political ambitions of Greece than by the spiritual needs of his flock. The Church took an unfriendly attitude towards the revolutionary movement in Macedonia. If independence was won, the national spirit of the Slavs stood in the way of the Greek dream of regaining Constantinople. Incidentally the Patriarch would lose all the temporal authority which he derived from the Sultan—and also his emoluments. Of course his partisans in Greece deny all these charges, and proclaim his saintly life and devoted service. But certain it is that back of the "quarrel of monks" was the conflict between the expanding nationalism of the Greeks and Slavs.

The Bulgars were the pioneers of libera-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. They also had great dreams of re-establishing the empire of Alexander, whom they loudly affirm was a Bulgar. One of their historians has gone so far as to claim that the real name of Alexander's father was Philip Makedonsky.

Towards the end of the last century religious differences were for a while laid aside, and the people of Macedonia pretty generally affiliated with a revolutionary society called the Interior Organization. There is no need to rehearse the horrors of Turkish rule in Macedonia. The unfortunate people had, like the Armenians—and equally in vain—been petitioning the Christian Powers of Europe to come to their aid. The feeling grew that their only hope was to make a desperate revolt, to shake Europe into intervention, as Greece had done. The Bulgars took the lead in this organization. At first it was popular with all factions. But the Greeks soon took fright at the threatened preponderance of the Slavs and became lukewarm. Finally jealousy grew up between the Serbs and Bulgars. The five years of insurrection from 1898 to 1903 failed utterly. The uprising was suppressed with barbaric ferocity, and Europe looked on unmoved.

Defeat always results in the ascendency of the most desperate element. The Interior Organization, deserted by the Greeks and Serbs, fell into the hands of desperadoes. Greeks were accused—sometimes with justice—of betraying Bulgarian revolutionists to the Turks. The Bulgarian bands retaliated by assassinating Greeks and burning their churches. Serbs, Greeks, Bulgars, worn out by the long struggle, stopped fighting to write books in which they accused each other of every form of treachery and outrage. All were exaggerated, but, unfortunately, all contained some truth. Out of the frenzied debate one fact is quite sure. The boundless ambition of the Greek and Bulgarian nationalists made Balkan unity and Macedonian liberty impossible.

Happily these times are passed. The last few years have seen new ministries in the Balkan States. Here in Greece they affectionately speak of their present Government as the "Common-Sense Ministry." Instead of trying to snatch some advantage from each other, the Balkan nations have been at work quietly and effectively organizing victory.

One of the results is that to-day the Greek flag flies over a larger territory than it ever did in the Golden Age.

The burning question of the future is, Will "common sense" triumph over the nationalist ambitions of the Allies? Common sense will make a compact federation out of the Balkan States, and they will hold all that they have gained in this frightfully expensive war.

But the spirit of nationalism, now that it has done its work, will, if unchecked, ruin every chance of orderly and happy development in the Balkans.

MONTENEGRO

BY ALFRED TENNYSON

A correspondent suggests that Tennyson's sonnet on Montenegro might well be worthy of a re-reading just now.—THE EDITORS.

They rose to where their sovran eagle sails,
  They kept their faith, their freedom, on the height,
  Chaste, frugal, savage, armed by day and night
  Against the Turk; whose inroad nowhere scales
The headlong passes, but his footstep fails,
  And red with blood the Crescent reels from fight
  Before their dauntless hundreds, in prone flight
  By thousands down the crags and through the vales.

O smallest among peoples! rough rock-throne
  Of Freedom! warriors beating back the swarm
  Of Turkish Islam for five hundred years,
Great Tsernogora! never since thine own
  Black ridges drew the cloud and brake the storm
  Has breathed a race of mightier mountaineers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF PEACE

BY HENRY CABOT LODGE

PART TWO

In Senator Lodge's first article, published in the issue of The Outlook for last week, he reviews not merely the causes and results of the War of 1812, but the period following the war, from 1820 to 1850, which he has aptly called "the period of the commentators and the critics." He points out that the "Quarterly Reviewers" and the writers in the "Edinburgh Review" who savagely criticised the people of the United States and their customs and manners did more than the respective Governments of the two countries "to inflame national rancors." In the present article Senator Lodge, after a brief reference to this critical period, goes on with the history of British and American political relationships.—THE EDITORS.

THE British Government had ceased to aim deliberately at alienating the United States after the Treaty of Ghent was made; and then it was that English writers, great and small, took up the work which the Government, for the time at least, had abandoned. Their operations were less dangerous because the issues of peace and war did not lie in their hands, but in creating a settled hate on the part of one people for another they were more effective than diplomatists and Ministers, because they wounded personal pride and made each member of the community feel humiliation or anger, according to his temperament, in his own particular person. To-day such writings on the part of the English or of any other nation would produce no effect of the slightest seriousness in the United States. After nations pass a certain point in their rise to greatness abuse by inhabitants of other countries may make the person uttering the abuse unpopular, but has less than no effect upon the nation or people abused. Between 1820 and 1850, when the United States was still struggling in the first stages of nation-building, when it was still largely a wilderness and its pioneers were forcing the frontier westward with daring and painful effort, this unmeasured abuse and savage criticism, whether just or not, was deeply felt. That it had an improving or instructive effect upon Americans, in view of the manner in which the instruction was administered, may well be doubted, but in making them angry and in turning them against England, and causing them to look with the friendly eyes of preference on almost every other nation, it was highly successful. In the relations of two great nations, speaking the same language and believing in the same political principles, it is not a pleasant period to look upon in the cold light of half a century later; yet I think, if rightly considered, it is not without its lesson, not only to those concerned, but to all who wish to maintain good relations among the nations of the earth.

During this same period, which may be called, as I have said, the period of the commentators and the critics, certain events occurred of a much more immediately serious nature, which brought the two countries to the verge of war. In the nature of things, we were certain to have many more matters of difference with Great Britain than with any other country, because her provinces lay to the north of the United States and furnished a common boundary line three thousand miles in length. What was much worse was the fact that this boundary line was left largely unsettled by the treaties of 1818 and 1827. One of the three treaties of 1827 provided for arbitration as to the northeast boundary, and the question was referred to the King of Holland as arbitrator. In 1831 the King rendered a decision, but as he really decided only two points and merely expressed an opinion on all the others, his award was rejected by the United States on the ground that it was not a decision of the questions submitted. Thus the entire matter was left open, and serious troubles soon began to arise on the northeastern boundary between the people of Maine on the one side and those of the adjoining British provinces on the other. An American surveyor was arrested. The State of Maine appropriated money and sent a force of men in Aroostook County to the border. There were similar difficulties in Madawaska. The English Government postponed action, and the question began to assume a very angry and threatening appearance. Meanwhile another disturbance broke out along the New York and Vermont frontiers. There had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been a rebellion in Canada against the bad government of that day, and the defeated patriots took refuge in the United States, where they met with a cordial reception. Considerable bodies of volunteers were raised. Secret organizations were formed to support the rebellious Canadians, a party of whom, under the leadership of William McKenzie, seized Navy Island, in the Niagara River, and fortified it. The authorities in Canada despatched Colonel McNab to guard the frontier against this invasion, and McNab sent out a party who seized and burned the steamer Caroline, which had been used to convey volunteers and munitions of war to Navy Island. The destruction of the Caroline took place at Fort Schlosser, on American territory, and was, of course, a gross violation of the sovereignty of the United States. The Government of the United States and the State governments behaved with entire propriety and broke up and checked, so far as they could, the movements of the patriots and their sympathizers. Nevertheless, acts of violence continued on both sides. A party of refugees in the Thousand Islands crossed to the Canadian side and burned the steamer Sir Robert Peel as a set-off for the Caroline, while the American steamer Telegraph was fired upon. It would require a volume of reasonable size to give a history of these border troubles, which are not without much human interest, but which have all fallen quite dim now, and which are hardly remembered except by the historian. In a brief review of the relations of England and the United States during one hundred years it is impossible to do more than allude to them. It must suffice to say here that the whole border from Maine to Michigan was not only disturbed, but in a most inflamed and explosive condition. It was just one of those situations where war might have been precipitated at any moment by reckless men who were quarreling over the possession of land and where a rebellion existed in one country which excited warm sympathy in the other. In addition, a case arose, growing out of the destruction of the Caroline, which aroused animosities even more than the actual troubles along the border. An American named Durfee had been shot and killed on the Caroline. Two years later a Canadian named Alexander McLeod came down from Canada and while he was drunk bragged of having himself killed Durfee. He was, of course, arrested, although it was afterwards shown that he had not been present at the destruction of the Caroline. But on his own admission it was perfectly proper to arrest him. The crime had been committed on American soil and McLeod had confessed himself to be the guilty man, yet none the less the English Government flew into a great rage and undertook to interfere with the action of the courts. Not content with this, it also saw fit to offer its advice in regard to the case of the Amistad, a Spanish vessel which had been seized by the slaves which she was carrying and had been run ashore at Long Island, where she was taken possession of by the Government. There was a very serious question as to what was to be done with the Negroes, but no part of the question concerned England the least in the world, and her benevolent advice, coming just at that moment, was deeply resented. In this condition of public sentiment, with England on the edge of declaring war on account of McLeod, and with the popular feeling in the United States greatly excited by the border troubles and the case of the Amistad, the Democrats went out of power and the Whigs came in, with Mr. Webster as Secretary of State. The situation was one of extreme and dangerous complexity. The British having avowed the destruction of the Caroline to be a governmental act, it was obvious that McLeod could not properly be held, but his case was in the State courts of New York, over the proceedings of which the United States had no control. Mr. Webster endeavored to secure the discharge of McLeod, but in vain, and the New York courts refused to grant a writ of habeas corpus. On the other side, Mr. Fox, the British Minister, saw fit to adopt a most offensive tone, which Mr. Webster was the last man in the world to submit to tamely. He took a firm attitude with England, while suggesting privately that negotiations should be opened for establishing a conventional northeastern line, and, as has just been said, he used his best efforts to secure the discharge of McLeod. This perilous situation was fortunately relieved by two incidents which came to pass outside the efforts of the Government. McLeod was acquitted at Utica by the simple process of proving an alibi; and the Whigs were beaten in England, an event which made Lord Aberdeen Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in place of Lord Palmerston. As has usually happened since the War of 1812, we fared much better with a Tory or Conservative administration than we did with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whigs and the Liberals. Response was now made to Mr. Webster's proposal to establish a conventional line, and in January, 1842, information reached Mr. Webster from Mr. Everett that Lord Aberdeen had determined to assent to our proposition, and had sent Lord Ashburton as special Minister to the United States to settle the boundary and all outstanding questions. This marked a sharp change in the English attitude, and was no doubt owing in a measure at least to the confidence which was felt in Mr. Webster personally. Indeed, it is to Mr. Webster that we owe the settlement at that time of questions which had been so inflamed by extraneous and accidental circumstances that they had brought the two countries to the verge of war.

Mr. Webster's position had throughout been one of extreme difficulty. Not only did he have to deal with the McLeod case, but the border was in a constant ferment and he was compelled to be constantly on the alert to prevent, if possible, outbreaks which might precipitate hostilities at any moment. In addition to all this his own personal situation was most trying. General Harrison, who had made him Secretary of State, died a month after his inauguration, and, although President Tyler gave his entire confidence to Mr. Webster, he immediately broke with the Whig party, which had elected him, and Mr. Webster's position became, in consequence, a very difficult one. The Whigs felt that he ought immediately to resign. He was denounced as a traitor to Whig principles, and there was much bitterness of feeling. Mr. Webster, however, understood the situation between this country and Great Britain better than any one else. He knew how dangerous it was. He felt, and rightly, that if any one could bring it to a peaceful conclusion he could, and that whatever his party associates might say or think, it was his plain duty to remain in the Cabinet until the English question was settled. Unmoved, therefore, by the attacks made upon him, he remained at his post, and it was well for the country that he did so. Lord Ashburton arrived in the United States on the 4th of April, 1842, and the result of his negotiations with the Secretary of State was the agreement known in history as the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, which was concluded on the 9th of August, 1842, and proclaimed in the following November. This result, however, was not easily reached, for the settlement was surrounded by difficulties, owing to the fact that the territory of the two States of Maine and Massachusetts was involved, and Webster could not deal with this territory, therefore, with a free hand. It was very fortunate that Mr. Webster was a New England man, and his personal influence as well as the tact he displayed was most effective in managing the arrangements with the two States. It is not possible to follow the negotiations in their details, for the discussion involved filled volumes at the time and might be made to fill volumes now. All that it is possible to say here is that the treaty brought about, in the first place, a condition of entire peace between the two countries and thus put an end to one in which war was momentarily probable. It settled the northeastern boundary and the northern boundary from Lake Huron to the Lake of the Woods, together with various matters related to these two questions. It also made an agreement for joint effort toward the suppression of the slave trade and for joint remonstrances to the other Powers against that traffic. It further provided in another article for the extradition of criminals. As a whole the treaty was a most important advance toward the establishment of good relations between the two branches of the English-speaking people. It was one of Mr. Webster's greatest achievements, and, in view of the extreme irritation existing and the incipient border warfare, it was a very remarkable feat. Benton denounced the treaty in the Senate as a surrender to England, and Lord Palmerston denounced it in Parliament as a surrender by England to the United States; from which it may be inferred that it was, on the whole, a very fair settlement.

The Webster-Ashburton Treaty had, however, one defect; it did not settle our northwestern boundary beyond the Rocky Mountains. That region, it will be remembered, under the treaties of 1818 and 1827 was left to the joint occupation of Great Britain and the United States, although Mr. Monroe had offered to settle the question by adopting the forty-ninth parallel as the line of division. The country remained unoccupied, but the Hudson Bay Company began to push its posts down to the Columbia River, and just when Mr. Webster was at work on the treaty with Lord Ashburton the American movement toward Oregon began in earnest. As soon as our settlers arrived there troubles at once arose, and the question drifted into the domain of politics. The failure of the Webster-Ashburton Treaty to deal with it and the absorption

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Administration in the much greater question of the annexation of Texas kept the whole matter open, with increasing irritation, although Mr. Tyler renewed the offer of the forty-ninth parallel, to which Great Britain paid no attention. The American rights and claims were taken up with noisy enthusiasm in different parts of the country, and were put forward by public meetings in the largest possible way. When the election of 1844 came on, the Democrats took extreme ground in their platform, claiming the whole region which was in dispute, and the cry of "Fifty-four forty or fight" ran through the campaign. The excitement was enhanced by the failure of Congress to act, for there were many Senators and Representatives from the older parts of the country who regarded Oregon as worthless, and who resisted all efforts to take action in regard to it. Mr. Polk, the Democratic candidate, was one of the extremists on the question and in favor of the 54-40 line. Nothing could have been less desirable than this attitude. It is never well to threaten, and it is particularly undesirable to threaten unless you mean just what you say. The people who were responsible for the cry of "Fifty-four forty or fight" did not really mean to fight for that line, and therefore the cry was mere bluster for political purposes. It had, however, the effect of inflaming the question, so that there was talk of war on both sides of the Atlantic. When Mr. Polk came in, he took very extreme ground in his inaugural, and this had a still worse effect in England, and increased the difficulty of a settlement. After all his bluster, however, Polk, with the very lame excuse that he was involved by the acts of his predecessor, renewed the offer of the forty-ninth parallel, which Mr. Pakenham, the British Minister, who was apparently about as judicious as Polk, promptly, and, as it afterward appeared, without authority, declined. President Polk in his Message asked Congress for authority to terminate the convention of 1827. Resolutions were passed and the convention was terminated. The situation had now become so threatening that Mr. Webster made a strong speech at Boston in which he denounced the folly of going to war with England on such a question and urged its proper settlement. The speech made a deep impression not only in England and America, but in Europe. Pakenham, under instructions from the Ministry, then renewed on his side the offer of the forty-ninth parallel, and the valiant Polk accepted it with the approval of Congress. The treaty of 1846 followed, by which the line to the coast was settled. We obtained the Oregon country and granted to Great Britain the right of navigation on the Columbia River. The loss of the region between the forty-ninth parallel and the line of 54-40 was one of the most severe which ever befell the United States. Whether it could have been obtained without a war is probably doubtful, but it never ought to have been said, officially or otherwise, that we would fight for 54-40 unless we were fully prepared to do so. If we had stood firm for the line of 54-40 without threats, it is quite possible that we might have succeeded in the end; but the hypotheses of history are of little practical value, and the fact remains that by the treaty we lost a complete control of the Pacific coast.

It is impossible, nor is it necessary, here to enter into the controversies which arose from the annexation of Texas and in which England took no little interest, but the great movement of expansion which characterized that period brought on another question with England which at one time was very serious and which resulted in a treaty that was for many years a stumbling-block in the way of all plans for building an Isthmian canal. From the time of Monroe, Clay, and John Quincy Adams the construction of an interoceanic canal had been one of the cherished desires of the United States. It passed through many phases, involved as it was in the tortuous and revolutionary conditions of Central America, but the question finally came to a head after the annexation of Texas. Great Britain had always, despite treaties to the contrary, maintained a hold on the Mosquito Coast, and was in the habit of exercising a protectorate over a person whom she humorously called the "Mosquito King," selected from the worthless savages who inhabited that region. She now took advantage of this interest in the Mosquito Coast to take possession of San Juan, which was at the mouth of the river where it was planned to begin the Nicaragua Canal. On the other hand, the United States engaged in the work of making arrangements with the Central American republics and with Granada to get possession of the canal routes. It is not necessary to follow the treaties made by Mr. Hise and later by Mr. Squier in which they exceeded their instructions and secured for us everything we desired. With England at the mouth of the San Juan and indulging herself in the seizure of Tigre Island

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and with the United States possessed of treaties entered into by the people of the countries through which the canal must pass, all the conditions were ripe for a very pretty quarrel, which thereupon duly arose There is no necessity of following it in all its intricacies, but the result was a treaty hastily made by Sir Henry Bulwer, the British Minister, and Mr. Clayton, Secretary of State, in order to prevent action upon the Squier treaty by the Senate.

The treaty thus made in 1850 provided that neither the United States nor Great Britain should ever obtain or maintain for themselves any exclusive control over the ship canal, or maintain any fortifications, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America. The treaty further provided for the neutrality of the canal in case of war and for the protection of its construction, which both Powers promised to facilitate. It also arranged for guarantees of neutrality and for invitations to other Powers to co-operate. This agreement settled the outstanding differences between England and the United States, but it was pregnant with other difficulties hardly less serious. In its nature it was an abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, for it provided for bringing in European Powers to deal with a purely American question, and it made it impossible for either the United States or Great Britain to build a canal without mutual co-operation. In process of time it became necessary to get rid of this treaty, which was not a wise one except so far as it removed a subject of great irritation at the moment.

This immediate effect it certainly had, and the next transaction between the two Governments was the treaty of 1854, which established reciprocity with Canada, and which, as was said at the time, was floated through by Lord Elgin upon seas of champagne. Although this treaty in its practical operation proved a disappointment to the United States, it was at least a distinctly friendly arrangement, and indicates how much relations between the United States and Great Britain, despite many vicissitudes, had improved since the War of 1812. This was shown even more emphatically a few years later when the Prince of Wales, then a boy of eighteen, came to the United States in the year 1860. Although the fateful election of that year was in progress and the country was torn by the political conflict, the Prince was received with the utmost cordiality by every one in authority from the President down and with real enthusiasm by the people. That he carried away pleasant memories of America was made evident throughout his life, and especially after he came to the throne, by his kindliness and friendship not only toward the United States, but toward all Americans. What was more important at the time, the warmth of his reception in the United States deeply gratified the Queen and Prince Albert, and was not without a marked influence a year later when the relations of the two countries and the fate of the American Union were trembling in the balance.

The Elgin Treaty, and, still more, the visit of the Prince of Wales just on the eve of the Civil War, came at a time when the people of the United States were so deeply absorbed in the slavery question at home that they had little thought to give to their relations with any foreign country. The passions aroused by the slavery struggle were rising to a fierce intensity and the dark clouds of secession and civil war were already gathering upon the horizon. With the coming of that war all that had been gained in the past years toward the establishment of permanent and really friendly relations between the two countries, which had been severed by the American Revolution, was lost in a moment. During the years which had elapsed between 1815 and 1860 the most severe reproach uttered by English lips against the United States was the continued maintenance of Negro slavery. The reproach was bitterly felt because no answer, no explanation, no defense, was possible. Now the United States was plunged in civil war waged by the North for the preservation of the Union, and all the world knew that the cause of the North carried with it freedom to the slaves. The people of the Northern States felt that under these circumstances and in that hour of trial the sympathy of England would go out to them at once without either question or hesitation. To their intense surprise, the feeling in England, as expressed in her magazines and newspapers and by the governing classes, was uniformly hostile. The vocal part of English society seemed to be wholly in sympathy with the South, and the North could not learn until later that the silent masses of England were on the side of the Union and freedom. The bitterness of hatred awakened by the utterances of the English press and English public men can hardly be realized to-day. Early in the struggle its in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tensity was manifested when the Trent affair occurred. The act of Wilkes in stopping the Trent and taking from her the Southern commissioners was entirely indefensible from our point of view because it was a flat contradiction of the American doctrine for which the country had fought in 1812. Yet in 1861 the people of the Northern States hailed the action of Wilkes with wild delight, and the hatred aroused by the English attitude was so great that they were quite ready to go to war, although war at that moment probably meant the establishment of the Confederacy and the final severance of the Union. This feeling was rife not only among the people of the North, but among public men in Washington. The attitude of England in regard to the Trent affair was not calculated to improve the situation, and yet, in all candor, it must be said that it is difficult to see how England could have assumed any other position than that which she actually took, although by doing so she utterly rejected the doctrine which she upheld and enforced during the first fifteen years of the century. Fortunately, in his large and patient wisdom, President Lincoln was able to suppress the very natural feeling which he shared with his people, and, looking beyond the passions of the moment, had the courage to withdraw from the untenable situation created by the action of Wilkes. On the other hand, English Ministers who were only too ready to take advantage of the Trent affair in order to precipitate a war which would have insured the destruction of the United States were sufficiently influenced by the wise counsels of Prince Albert, acting through the Queen, by whom American kindness to the Prince of Wales was still freshly remembered, to modify a despatch which, if unaltered, would almost certainly have brought on war and the establishment of the Confederacy. Lincoln gave up Mason and Slidell, and the country, unconvinced, accepted his action. The feeling of the people was exactly expressed in Lowell's lines:

> "We give the critters back, John,
> Cos Abram thought 'twas right;
> It warn't your bullying clack, John,
> Provokin' us to fight.
> Ole Uncle S. sez he, 'I guess
> We've a hard row,' sez he,
> 'To hoe jest now; but thet somehow
> May happen to J. B.
> Ez wal ez you an' me.'"

The avoidance, by Lincoln's action, of this great peril did not, however, alter—on the contrary, it intensified—the hostile feeling of the loyal people of the North toward England, nor was there anything in the utterances or conduct of those who spoke for England calculated to produce a change. The vilification of the United States and her President and of all her leaders and soldiers in the magazines and newspapers went on without ceasing and without modification. From British ports and British shipyards armed vessels slipped away which, although nominally ships of the Confederate navy, pursued in reality a simple career of privateering closely akin to piracy. The only one of them which actually came into action was destroyed by the Kearsarge, and an English yacht rescued the Southern officers and the British crew of the sinking Alabama. This business of furnishing a Confederate navy from the ports and shipyards of a neutral country went on with the covert support of the British Cabinet until the case of the Laird rams was reached. Protests even then were in vain, and it was not until Mr. Adams wrote down the famous words, "It is superfluous in me to point out to your Lordship that this is war," that the rams were stopped and English ports ceased to send forth privateers. In the great life-and-death struggle in which the people of the United States were then engaged the loss of some merchant ships on the high seas was an injury so comparatively trifling in its effect upon the result that it was hardly perceptible; but the course of England which permitted the destruction of merchant vessels in this way was, in the eyes of the American people, a crime of the first magnitude. The leaders of the English Cabinet were not friendly, although Lord Palmerston, fortunately for us, was more indifferent and less actively hostile than was generally supposed, and neither he nor Lord John Russell, who was much less friendly, was disposed to precipitate war. The one outspoken champion of the Confederacy was Gladstone; but fate so willed it that in striving to harm the United States he rendered it a great and decisive service. It was in the autumn of 1862, a very dark hour in the fortunes of the United States. The Ministry were preparing to recognize the Confederacy. The Queen, since the death of Prince Albert, as Mr. Charles Francis Adams has recently shown, had ceased to interest herself in American affairs. A Cabinet meeting was called for October 23, and then the recognition of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Confederacy was to be given. On the 7th of October Mr. Gladstone, anticipating the action of the Cabinet, went to Newcastle and delivered the famous speech in which he declared that "Jefferson Davis had made a nation." Lord Palmerston saw his successor in Gladstone, but he had no intention of letting him rule before his time. He resented the Newcastle speech; he did not propose to have Mr. Gladstone force his hand, and a week later he sent Sir George Lewis down to Hereford to controvert and disavow the Newcastle utterances. The Cabinet meeting on the 23d was postponed, but the accepted time had passed, and never returned. Mr. Gladstone's speech, however, did its work in the United States, still further embittering the already intense and deep-seated enmity toward England and her Government. We had friends, it is true—some even in the Cabinet, like Sir George Lewis—but the general attitude of the English Ministry was such that, while it inflamed the enmity of the North, it was far from gaining the friendship of the South, because, while the South was amused with sympathetic expressions and encouraged to hope for substantial support, it never received anything of real value, thus being left with an unpleasant sense of having been betrayed. A system more nicely calculated to incur the hostility of both sides in the great quarrel could not have been imagined, and it does not seem unjust to suggest that such a system did not imply a very high order of intelligence. Only very slowly and entirely outside the Government did it become apparent that the Union and freedom had any friends in England. The first public man to declare for the North was Richard Cobden, and he was followed by John Bright, whose powerful and most eloquent speech on the Roebuck resolution was one of the greatest services rendered by any man, not an American, to the cause of the Union. Lord Houghton, then Monckton Milnes, also spoke for us in the House of Commons. Mr. Forster was our friend, so were John Stuart Mill, Goldwin Smith, and Thomas Hughes; and there were others, of course, like these men, whose support it was an honor to possess.

The workingmen of Lancashire, reduced to misery by the cotton famine, were none the less true in their sympathy for the cause which they believed to be that of human rights and human freedom. But these voices, potent as they were, were lost in the general clamor which arose from the clubs at London, from the newspapers, and from the reviews. The desire to side actively with the South declined, of course, as the fortunes of the Confederacy sank, but the contemptuous abuse of the North went on without abatement. Even so late as the last year of the war as clever a man as Charles Lever demonstrated, in "Blackwood's Magazine," to his own satisfaction the folly and absurdity of Sherman's great movement. The article appeared just in time to greet Sherman as he emerged triumphant at Savannah.

Sherman's march to the sea, following jeers and predictions like those put forth by Lever, produced a profound impression in England, which then, at last, seemed to become dimly conscious that a great war had been fought out by great armies. The end of the war and the complete triumph of the Union cause soon followed. As in games, so in more serious things, Englishmen are excellent winners, but, as a rule, poor losers, apt to cry out, when they have lost, that there has been something unfair and to try to belittle and explain away their adversary's victory. In this case, however, England showed herself a good loser, for the result was too serious to be treated with contempt or with charges of unfairness. Moreover, England found herself confronted not only by the success of the United States, and the consequent consolidation of the Union, but by a very unfortunate situation which she had herself created. She had managed to secure the bitter hostility of both sides. She had given sympathy to the South, but had done nothing practical for the cause of the Confederacy, and at the same time she had outraged the feelings of the Northern people and developed among them a bitterness and dislike which, when they were flushed with victory, might easily have had most serious consequences. It is quite true that she had not behaved so badly toward the United States as France, which had stopped just short of war. When England, France, and Spain united to exact reparation from Mexico, England and Spain withdrew as soon as they discovered that France intended to establish a government of her own creation on Mexican soil. Not only was the French Government sympathetic with the South, but Napoleon was more than anxious to recognize the Confederacy, and took advantage of our Civil War to fit out the Mexican expedition and estab-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lish Maximilian as Emperor. As soon as the war was over we forced France out of Mexico, and the unfortunate Maximilian, an amiable and brave man, but of less than mediocre capacity, was executed by his subjects and offered up as a sacrifice to his incautious reliance upon the French Emperor and to his own ignorance of the peril of infringing the Monroe Doctrine.

Yet, despite all this, the people of the United States cared very little about what France had done, and felt bitterly all that the English had said. The attitude of the French Government during our Civil War, which there is no reason to suppose was the attitude of the French people, no doubt caused Americans generally to sympathize with Germany in the war of 1870, but except for that sympathy we regarded with great indifference the French treatment of the United States during the Civil War. Very different was the relation to England. As soon as the war was over the era of apology began on the part of England, finding its first expression in Tom Taylor's well-known verses upon the death of Lincoln. The acknowledgment of their mistakes, however, produced but slight impression in the United States, where there was a universal determination to exact due reparation for the conduct of England, and especially for the depredations of the Alabama and the other cruisers let loose from British shipyards to prey upon our commerce. Attempts were at once made to settle these differences, but the Johnson-Clarendon treaty was rejected by the Senate, and when Grant came to the Presidency there was a strong feeling, represented by Mr. Sumner, in favor of making no demands on England, but of obtaining our redress by taking possession of Canada. With a veteran army of a million men and a navy of over seven hundred vessels, including some seventy ironclads, the task would not have been a difficult one. President Grant and Mr. Fish, however, decided upon another course, and were really unwilling to adopt a policy which, however justifiable, might have carried the country into another war. The result was that England sent out a special commission to Washington to make a treaty. Mr. Gladstone, who was then Prime Minister, behaved with manliness and courage. He admitted frankly the great mistake he had made in his Newcastle speech, and bent all his energies to reaching a settlement with the United States which would satisfy Americans and so far as possible heal the wounds inflicted by England's attitude and by English utterances during the war. In the first article of the treaty of 1871, which followed, it is said:

"Her Britannic Majesty has authorized her high commissioners and plenipotentiaries to express in a friendly spirit the regret felt by her Majesty's Government for the escape under any circumstances of the Alabama and other vessels from British ports and for the depredations committed by those vessels."

It must have been a serious trial not only for a Ministry but for a proud and powerful nation thus formally and officially to apologize for its past conduct, and yet, unless England was ready for war and for the loss of Canada, no other method seemed possible. It is greatly to England's credit and to the credit of the Government of that day that they were willing to express their regret for having done wrong.

The treaty established a court of arbitration to consider and pass upon the claims. It also provided for referring the differences in regard to the line of our boundary through the Fuca Straits to the Emperor of Germany, who subsequently made an award wholly in favor of the United States. The treaty also dealt with many other questions, including fishery rights, the navigation of the St. Lawrence and of Lake Michigan, the use of canals and the conveyance of merchandise in bond through the United States. In due course the claims were taken before the Geneva tribunal. The arbitration came dangerously near shipwreck, owing to the projection into it of the indirect claims, so called; which were urged in a powerful speech by Mr. Sumner in the Senate, but the tribunal wisely excluded them, and the case came to a decision, an award of $15,500,000 being made to the United States for the damages caused by the Alabama and her sister ships.

So far as the official relations of the two countries were concerned, the Treaty of Washington restored them to the situation which had existed before the Civil War. Once again we were, officially speaking, on good and friendly terms with Great Britain, but the feeling left among the people of the United States by England's attitude remained unchanged, and the harsh and bitter things which had been said in England during our days of trial and suffering still rankled deeply. This was something which only the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passage of time could modify, and the wounds which had been made took long to heal, although the healing process was facilitated by the fact that the Civil War had made the people of the United States profoundly indifferent to foreign criticism. There was, moreover, no clash between the countries until many years after the Treaty of Washington, and when the next difficulty arose it came not from any immediate difference between England and the United States, but grew out of an English invasion of the Monroe Doctrine in South America.

For many years there had been a dispute between England and Venezuela as to the boundary between that country and the possessions of England in British Guiana. Venezuela, weak and distracted by revolution, had sought more than once for arbitration, which England would not grant. On the contrary, the British Government had steadily pushed its line forward and extended its claims until it was found that it was gradually absorbing a large part of what had always been considered Venezuelan territory. Venezuela had broken off diplomatic relations, but nothing had succeeded in checking the English advances. The offer of the good offices of the United States had been equally fruitless, and finally the matter reached a crisis, and Mr. Cleveland, on December 17, 1895, sent in his famous Message. After reviewing the Venezuelan question and the efforts that we had made toward a peaceful settlement, the President recommended that an American commission be appointed to examine the question and report upon the matter. He said that when such report was made "it would be the duty of the United States to resist by every means in its power as a willful aggression upon its rights and interests the appropriation by Great Britain of any lands or the exercise of governmental jurisdiction over any territory which after investigation we have determined of right belongs to Venezuela." The Message concluded with the following sentence: "I am, nevertheless, firm in my conviction that, while it is a grievous thing to contemplate the two great English-speaking peoples of the world as being otherwise than friendly competitors in the onward march of civilization and strenuous and worthy rivals in all the arts of peace, there is no calamity which a great nation can invite which equals that which follows a supine submission to wrong and injustice and the consequent loss of national self-respect and honor, beneath which are shielded and defended a people's safety and greatness." The language employed by the President was vigorous and determined. At the time it was thought rough. England was surprised, and operators in the stock market were greatly annoyed. The closing words of the Message, which was a very able one, do not seem quite so harsh to-day as they did at the time when they were read to Congress. President Cleveland, moreover, however much Wall Street might cry out, had the country with him, and no one to-day, I think, can question the absolute soundness of his position.

With the possessions of any European Power in the Western Hemisphere we, of course, did not meddle, but it was the settled policy of the country that those possessions should not be extended or new ones created. The forcible seizure of American territory by a European Power would be, of course, an obvious violation of the Monroe Doctrine, which this country believes essential to its safety; but the gradual grasping of American territory on the basis of shadowy, undetermined, and constantly widening claims, differed from forcible seizure only in degree. If the land in dispute belonged to Great Britain, we had nothing whatever to say, but so long as it was in controversy the United States had the right to demand that that controversy should be settled by a proper tribunal under whose decision the world should know just what belonged to England and what to Venezuela. President Cleveland's strong declaration surprised England, but it brought her to terms. She woke up to the fact that the day had long since passed when the United States could be trifled with on any American question, and the soundness of Mr. Cleveland's judgment was shown by the fact that within a year the question was referred to a tribunal which met in Paris and which consisted of two Americans, two Englishmen, and one Russian jurist. The American judges were Chief Justice Fuller and Mr. Justice Brewer, of the Supreme Court. They went to Paris with the somewhat innocent idea that they were to hear the case and decide it on its merits, exactly as they decided a case in their own Supreme Court. They found, however, that the two English judges had no such conception of their functions, but were there as representatives of England, holding the positions of advocates instead of judges. The result was that the decision rested with the fifth man, Mr. Martens, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he, apparently under instructions not strictly judicial, was prepared to decide entirely in favor of England, although the English case for a large part of the claim was of the most shadowy character. It was very important, however, to England that the award should be signed by all the arbitrators, and that which was most essential to Venezuela was to preserve her control of the mouths of the Orinoco. The American arbitrators consented to sign the award if the mouths of the Orinoco were left to Venezuela, and this was done, all the rest of the disputed territory going to England. If the rest of the territory belonged to England, the mouths of the Orinoco also should have been hers. If the mouths of the Orinoco belonged to Venezuela, England was not entitled to a large part of what she received. In other words, the judgment of the arbitral tribunal was a compromise and not a decision on the merits of the case, in which it followed the course of most arbitrations and disclosed the weakness of which arbitral tribunals have hitherto nearly always been guilty. This failing is that they do not decide a case on its merits, but make a diplomatic compromise, giving something to each side. It is this tendency or practice of arbitral tribunals which has caused them to be distrusted, and especially in the United States, because, while the United States has no questions in Europe, Europe has many questions of interest in the Western Hemisphere, and the result has been on more occasions than one that the United States has been drawn into an arbitration where it could gain nothing and was certain to lose if any compromise was effected. In this particular instance, however, the result which Mr. Cleveland desired and which he sought to reach by his Message was fully attained. The boundary was determined, the process of gradual encroachment on a weak American state under cover of claims more or less artificial and advanced by a powerful European nation was stopped, and an end was put once and for all to the plan of securing new American possessions by the insidious method of starting and developing claims and then refusing to have the claims settled and boundaries determined by any tribunal. Mr. Cleveland rendered a very great public service by his action and caused the Powers of Europe to understand and appreciate the force and meaning of the Monroe Doctrine as they had never done before.

Three years after President Cleveland's Venezuelan Message the United States was at war with Spain. Admiral Dewey's fleet had captured Manila, and the great European Powers hastened to send war-ships to the scene of action. Some of these vessels were more powerful than any which Admiral Dewey had in his fleet, and the German Admiral behaved in a way which came very near bringing on serious trouble between his country and the United States. Admiral Dewey's firmness put an end to the disagreeable attitude of the Germans, but he also received assurances of support from Captain Chichester, in command of the English ships, which were of great value. This almost open act of friendliness, which recalled the old days in China when Commodore Tatnall went to the aid of the English, declaring that "blood was thicker than water," was merely representative of the attitude of the English Government. The sympathies of Europe were with Spain, but England stood by the United States, and this fact did more to wipe out the past and make the relations between the two countries what they should have been long before than all the years which had elapsed since the bitter days of the Civil War.

England's attitude, moreover, toward the United States during the war with Spain was only a part of the general policy of the Government then in control. When the Panama Canal, the interest in which had been steadily growing, reached a point where the United States was determined that the Canal should be built, it was found that the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was a stumbling-block to any movement on the part of the United States. The American feeling was so strong that Congress was only too ready to abrogate the treaty by its own action, but, the question being brought to the attention of Lord Salisbury, the English Government showed itself more than willing to join with the United States in superseding the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty by a new one under which the United States should have a free hand in dealing with the Canal. The first Hay-Pauncefote Treaty failed, owing chiefly to having incorporated in it a provision by which it was agreed that the Powers of Europe should be entitled to join in the neutralization of the Canal. This, on our part, was of course inviting the destruction of the Monroe Doctrine, and the Senate amended the treaty. England refused to accept the Senate amendments, but proceeded to make with us a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

second treaty which conformed to the changes proposed by the Senate, and which was ratified without opposition.

The policy manifested by the attitude of England in regard to the Canal question, which had followed upon the end of the Spanish War, was closely followed, and was indeed enlarged, by Mr. Balfour when he succeeded Lord Salisbury as Prime Minister. President McKinley, in his desire to settle all possible outstanding questions with Great Britain—questions which related entirely to Canada—had brought about a meeting of an Anglo-American commission in Washington. It became evident that all questions could be easily arranged, with the exception of the Alaskan boundary, and upon that the difference was so sharp that the commission adjourned without having reached any conclusion at all in any direction. All the other differences remained in abeyance, but the Alaskan question became constantly more perilous. Nations, like men, will fight about the possession of land when they will fight about nothing else, and the Alaskan question, which caused a great deal of feeling in the Northwest, was rapidly approaching the dangerous stage. A treaty to submit the boundary of Alaska to an international tribunal, consisting of three Americans and three representatives of Canada and Great Britain, was made and ratified in 1903. The English representatives were two distinguished Canadians and Lord Alverstone, the Lord Chief Justice of England. The case was fully argued, and the decision was almost wholly in favor of the contention of the United States, which was owing to the action of Lord Alverstone, who decided in the main against the Canadian claim.

Thus the one question which was pregnant with real danger was eliminated, and the other differences with Canada were rapidly disposed of in the succeeding years of President Roosevelt's Administration while Mr. Root was Secretary of State. One treaty settled the international boundary, another provided for the protection of the fisheries on the Lakes, another for the international waterways, and, finally, the long-contested question of our rights in the Newfoundland fisheries went to The Hague for determination under a treaty framed by Mr. Root.

All these important agreements which made for the best relations between Great Britain and the United States grew out of the attitude of England at the time of the Spanish War, and were due to the policy of which Mr. Balfour in particular, and Lord Lansdowne, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, were the chief exponents. In a speech at Manchester Mr. Balfour said:

> The time may come—nay, the time must come—when some statesman of authority, more fortunate even than President Monroe, will lay down the doctrine that between English-speaking peoples war is impossible.

To that noble sentiment Mr. Balfour and Lord Lansdowne strictly adhered, and to their action we owe the settlement of all these questions which have perplexed us with our northern neighbor, and, in consequence, the good relations which now exist between Great Britain and the United States, and which it is to be hoped will always continue. The policy might have been adopted in 1798 as well as in 1898, but Mr. Balfour and Lord Lansdowne were the first English statesmen who not only saw, but put into effect, their belief that the true policy for England was to be friends with the United States, and that friendship could be brought about by treating the United States, not as had been the practice in the past, but as one great nation should always be treated by another. They came to us, it is true, in the hour of our success, but none the less they are entitled to a place in the memory of Americans with Burke and Fox and Chatham, with Cobden and with Bright, who did not forget the common language and the common aspirations for freedom in the days when the Americans were a little people struggling to exist, or in those still darker days when the United States was trying to preserve the unity of the great Nation which Washington had founded and which Lincoln was destined to save.

The movement for the celebration of the centenary of the Treaty of Ghent, which occurs on Christmas Eve of 1914, has made rapid progress in the countries most concerned. The Outlook will follow the movement with news and editorial treatment, and will also publish at an early date an illustrated review of the inception and development of this international commemoration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPECTATOR

THE Spectator once overheard a little girl telling a make-believe story to her dolls about a princess—doubtless appareled in her mind after a Blum drawing —who lived in a beautiful palace in a "great big" garden. In this garden, she informed the respectfully silent dolls, grew a—no, *the* —money tree. It was as singular as that in the Garden of Eden, and perhaps of the same genus, for its fruit was golden coins. Every branch bent with the weight of them, they shone in the sun, twinkling this way and that, jingling musically as they were stirred by the breeze of this magic garden, and if now and then one dropped and was picked up by a page or palace guard no one minded, for, like tropical oranges, more kept on growing all the time. The Spectator thought of this little girl and her money tree when he stepped out on the porch on an October morning and saw the early sunlight glinting upon the burnished yellow leaves of the old black birch beyond the cliff's edge as they trembled in the wind; and in the midst of them sat a blue jay—a sapphire bird in a gilded cage.

This aged tree grows just in front of the crag upon whose summit the house is built, so that as the Spectator stands in his doorway he sees only a few feet of the trunk, surmounted by a gnarled and bushy crown whose nearness throws into still more remote and pleasing perspective, as in an artist's drawing, the landscape of rocks and woods and distant fields that stretches away to the sky-line of Poppletown Hill; and that crown, green in spring, golden in autumn, blends with the sky aloft in a fringe of innumerable gray twigs. This hoary cap seems a natural mark of age and dignity. When, water-bucket in hand, one walks down the winding stairway-path descending from ledge to ledge between mossy rocks, one presently sees the dark column of its leaning trunk, and finds the spring gushing from the crag-foot near its roots. The base of this column is a mass of stones and knotty roots; its capital the spreading leafage which was level with our eyes above, and whose lowest branches are now sixty feet above our heads. A heap of fire-wood is piled negligently against it; and nothing could be more natural. If the old tree could express feeling, it would perhaps tell us it would miss the companionship of the slivery sticks were they taken away, for all its life it has been associated with these riven remnants of its brethren; but there is only a cord there now, when a thousand might safely lean their weight upon its sturdy support!

It would be a keen woodsman who, from a glance at its trunk alone, could name this relic of bygone conditions. The record of a hard youth and the wrinkles of age and misfortune have made such crowded scars upon its trunk that no room is left, at any rate on the lower half of the column, for that natural and distinctive growth of bark which in a tree of even life is a signature easily recognized. That this tree must be very old is plain, not only from the great girth of its bole, but from the fact that for at least three-fourths of its height, which cannot be far short of a hundred feet, there is not a single limb, showing that it grew in a forest whose dense shade stunted and killed all the lower twigs; and now its top is a thick bunch of strong, irregular branches which, cramped for room at first, have suffered breakage year by year, during the long period since its sheltering mates were removed, by the buffeting of the winter gales. As becomes a subject so full of years, its crown is gray with dead and dying twigs, as has been noted, yet beneath them flourishes a mass of foliage, showing plentiful vigor. The roots still hold firmly to the rocks, still feed upon the rich muck, still drink of the spring whose surplus waters, clear and cool, bubble out of the soil beneath the old tree's shade and take the Spectator's daily blessing. Nor is his the only benison. A President of the United States has cooled his brow in its shadow; the Spectator has seen the two Johns of outdoor literature—John Burroughs and John Muir—leaning against its trunk while they talked; and many another person of importance has it looked down upon.

What accident or purpose kept this tree from the ax when its neighbors were first cut off a century or more ago—for these rocky ridges have been timber-cutting ground ever since the Dutch first settled at Esopus and named them Schaffenberg—may be only conjectured; but the most natural guess is that it was a landmark in the most literal meaning of the term—a boundary mark. All over

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country big lone trees still stand—and formerly were more numerous than now—which were never felled because mentioned in old deeds. Latterly, however, its misfortunes rather have saved it from destruction—a paradox you would understand could you see its scarred and knotty trunk, discouraging both the ax of the wood-cutter and the greed of the lumberman. This ruin came about in this way: The rough ledges, piled like broken stairs six hundred feet in height, drop on this side at their base in sheer cliffs to a rounded basin two or three hundred yards wide, with a narrow tributary ravine. When the last Catskill glacier, whose marks remain so plainly engraved upon these tough gneissic rocks, melted back toward its head, this hollow became filled with water and formed an icy lake, receiving the drainage of the ravine and overflowing through a notch at one end. Gradually soil accumulated on the borders, plants and bushes and finally a forest covered them, and then beavers found the place and set up a colony. The washing down of earth and leaves, sticks, logs, and overblown trees, and the labor of the beavers—we uncover relics of their industry—slowly filled the depths of the basin.

Along its edges grew little by little a bordering bog of ferns, swamp mosses, and aquatic weeds, reaching out into a rim of floating quagmire that gave rootage more and more to willows, black alders, and similar water-loving trees and shrubs. This filling was not a simple mud. The surrounding woods consisted largely of oak, cedar, and hemlock, whose barks abound in tannin and mineral salts; and these, dissolved out and soaking into every shred of wood, tanned it with a preservative that insured immunity from decay—even formed nodules of hematite here and there. Thus when the lake had been filled, and white men finally cleared the swamp of its trees and pried or blasted out the stumps and buried logs, they were rewarded by a level plain of red muck that when dry powders into shreds of wood rather than earthen grains.

Long before this last utilization, however, the farmers had built a rude sled-road along the hither side of the swamp by which to haul out logs and fire-wood. They would climb the forested cliffs, fell the trees, cut them into desired lengths, and then, along roughly cleared ways, hurl them down the declivities to the edge of the swamp. It was the blows received from these tumbling billets that broke the bark of the birch and made the great scars in their healing which now roughen its bole.

This lofty black birch, standing clear yet overlooking the wooded hillside where innumerable nesting-places and small lairs were concealed, became a veritable house-of-call for the birds of the neighborhood and for other animals on various errands. Its deeply seamed bark was the hiding-place of bugs, beetles, and moths, or of their eggs, and winter and summer was dug into and hunted over by titmice, nuthatches, creepers, woodpeckers, and the querulous creeping warbler, who fancied himself invisible in his black-and-white stripes, but defeated this "protective resemblance" by his constant restlessness. Before the buds had burst came the Canada sparrows, challenging with their lovely voices the supremacy of the song-sparrows below. Then, when the small catkins and starting leaves made a greenish mist about the head of the tree, one would glimpse the Nashville warblers, precisely matching in tint the "pussies" to which they clung, busily searching the blossoms for the tiny insects gathered there, and contributing, no doubt, to the cross-pollination of the flowers.

When the nesting season was fairly on, this lofty hospice became a regular watch-tower for numberless song-birds whose mates were brooding in near-by thickets. These came to know and tolerate one another, while strangers were regarded with distrust. Two summers in succession a humming-bird perched day after day for weeks on a certain topmost spray, glancing into the air now and then to snatch at a fly, but rarely leaving his post more than a few minutes. Vireos, wood-thrushes, robins, jays, indigo-finches, and others waited and watched there until their domestic anxieties were over.

These birds sometimes had troubles of their own. One day the Spectator was aroused by a tremendous commotion in the tree-top, and hurried out to see an immense blacksnake creeping in long festoons over the topmost furze of the old birch's crown. It was amazing—first, that the brittle twigs

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would hold his weight, and, second, that he could be there at all. It is true the trunk leaned a trifle, but it was sixty feet of naked shaft. A snake—even a constrictor—does not wind itself about a tree, but glides up it sinuously, just as it progresses on level ground. This blacksnake had nothing save the roughnesses of the bark to cling to, and if it had slipped and fallen when even halfway up it surely would have been killed. The birds were fighting it, summoning help from all quarters, and soon drove it down among the leaves, where it disappeared. The Spectator watched a long time for its farther descent, but failed to witness it. He wonders how the marauder could have got safely to the ground at all. A serpent cannot crawl backward, and it is equally difficult to suppose that it could go down a practically vertical tree-trunk head first. When it disappeared, it perhaps escaped the fury of the birds by gliding into a hole in the trunk just under the crown, where a large limb had been wrenched away long ago; and its bones may be there yet.

That cavity once had for three successive seasons far more pleasing tenants—a pair of wood-ducks, the most showy of American water-fowl. Secure in their inaccessible height (for no man could climb that tree without machinery), they came and went regardless of the Spectator or others, and reared their young in happiness. But it certainly was a queer place for a duck's nest—twenty yards up in the air and a mile from a swimming-pool. Everybody was eager to see how the little ones got down, or were got down, but none caught sight of the process. The Spectator was very sorry when the pair ceased to appear.

The old black birch still stands, and is likely to do so for years to come. Very probably its gray head will outlast that of the Spectator himself.

A BOOK A WEEK

IT is proposed to talk in this place, familiarly rather than critically, week by week, about some one book or perhaps group of books. Out of the hundreds of volumes that come every year from the publishers there are surely many more than fifty-two that are worthy of attention; in other ways the entertaining or instructive values of others will be recognized in The Outlook; but just here in each number one will be discussed in a free and friendly way, not as a duty but as a pleasure, and in some measure as a record of the special interest in literature of the weeks as they pass.

And this first book-talk is suggested by what may be called an old-new book. For more than twenty years this reviewer has had an affection for a little volume in green covers in which he first met and liked Gilbert Parker as a writer of American fiction. Nowadays the author is Sir Gilbert and a Member of Parliament, but the great bulk of his writing is American still—clear, crisp writing of the Northern wilds, about trappers and Hudson Bay Company's men, and about the deep things also that belong not to place or climate or life's conditions, but to human nature, temperament, passion, and character. Other writers have invaded his territory of the Canadian North, but, good as is the work of Jack London and Norman Duncan and others, nothing has been done in this field stronger or finer than Gilbert Parker's tales of "Pierre and His People." His most notable novels of later days, such as "The Right of Way" and "The Seats of the Mighty," are broader in their knowledge of life and more varied in situation and the interworking of motive, but in atmosphere and truth the little green volume holding "When Valmond Came to Pontiac" is their equal. It is interesting to note, moreover, that this very story was the one in which Sir Gilbert first found himself, as Mr. Kipling would say. It was the appearance of "When Valmond Came to Pontiac" that led an English critic (quoted lately with assent by Sir Gilbert) to admit that a former comment that the author "had not probed deep enough into the wounds of character he had inflicted" no longer held good, and that his place as a novelist had become assured. A previous novel, "Mrs. Falchion," and a few South Sea tales had won the attention of the reading public, but only with the appearance of the vigorous tales about Pierre and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his People and this very romance of Valmond did Mr. Parker take a separate place in American literature.

The little green volume, then, marks the turning-point in a career of fiction-production that has been of permanent value, and now its place on the book-shelf is to be taken by a collected edition of Sir Gilbert Parker's works, four volumes of which have already issued from the press of Charles Scribner's Sons, of New York, in form not unlike the excellent Outward Bound Edition of Kipling. Eighteen volumes are planned, but when an author is reasonably young and at the apparent height of his literary vigor, the fortunate owner of a collective edition may look forward with pleasurable expectation to the addition of new volumes which he may put beside their predecessors, hoping that they will mark a continuous gain in power and beauty. That this anticipation is sometimes followed by disappointment is one of the risks attached to the nature of collective editions. The literary clock cannot always strike twelve. In this case at least there is every reason to regard these eighteen volumes as "final" only in the technical sense. Sir Gilbert is now dealing with political and social life in England; his publishers' use of the resounding title "The Imperial Edition" is justified by stories dealing with India, Egypt, South Africa, and Australia; his serial now undergoing magazine publication shows that his originality and his command of style are still at their best; but one rejoices to turn back to these stories of the scattered people of the Canadian North.

Of the form of the Imperial Edition there may be made only one remark in general and two in particular: the edition is worthy of companionship with the fine collective editions of Kipling, Stevenson, and Meredith put forth by the Messrs. Scribner; in particular, the paper is a joy to the eye and the hand, but (and here is the second particular remark) one earnestly hopes that the lovely maroon covers will not, in the course of a few years on the shelves, assume the faded tints that time has developed on the somewhat similar binding of the Kipling Outward Bound Edition. Permanency of color in binding ought to be a prime quality in library books, and there are few reds and maroons of which one does not harbor suspicion.

When the question is asked, What are the essential qualities of Gilbert Parker's work? the answer is simple. He has sincerity and clarity and he knows how to hold his situation in what may be termed moral suspense. With him the main point is not what is going to happen, but what this or that man or woman will work out of the stress of a special problem. And this applies as well to the bold adventurer as to the sophisticated man or woman of culture. "The Right of Way" is a striking illustration of this kind of suspense of interest, and because the *crux* applies so strongly to universal human nature, this book perhaps presents Sir Gilbert's writing at its best. A passage from one of the introductory talks with readers with which the author is prefacing the new volumes will give his own idea of the relation of local color (in which he is a past-master) to universality of theme. Speaking of the Pierre romances, he remarks: "It has been said that, apart from the color, form, and setting, the incidents of these stories might have occurred anywhere. That is true beyond doubt, and it exactly represents my attitude of mind. Every human passion, every incident springing out of a human passion to-day, had its counterpart in the time of Amenhotep. The only difference is in the setting, or is in the language or dialect which is the vehicle of expression, and in race or character, which are the media of human idiosyncrasy." More concretely and less philosophically, he adds: "The atmosphere of a story or novel is what temperament is to a man. Atmosphere cannot be created; it is not a matter of skill; it is a matter of personality, of the power of visualization, of feeling for the thing which the mind sees. It has been said of my books that they possess atmosphere. . . . The truth is that while the episode, which is the first essential of a short story, was always in the very forefront of my imagination, the character or characters meant infinitely more to me. To my mind the episode was always the consequence of character."

This is sound literary dogma, and it is because Sir Gilbert Parker has taken his purpose and work in this spirit—seriously, if you will, but at all events with something more than the idea of playing on the strings first of the comic and then of the melodramatic—that his stories do both arouse the imagination and create characters in comparison with whom the dummies in the average novels of the day are less than nothing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW BOOKS

Business of Being a Woman (The). By Ida M. Tarbell. The Macmillan Company, New York. $1.25.

There can be no question that Miss Tarbell understands this exacting, responsible, and paying business. She is painfully correct in fearing that the modern woman is losing the zest for and faith in every-day activities. It is not easy to pursue "the daily round, the common task," and never forget that in them may be found room to deny ourselves and see visions of higher things than lie about our feet. The chapter on "The Woman and Democracy" is a serious arraignment of all women as failures in the one business of which they have always had control, domestic service. In closing Miss Tarbell defines the effect of woman's business in these telling words: "The meaning of woman's natural business in the world, the part it has played in civilizing humanity, in forcing good morals and good manners, in giving a reason and so a desire for peaceful arts and industries, the place it has had in persuading men and women that only self-restraint, courage, good cheer, and reverence produce the highest types of manhood and womanhood—this is written on every page of history." To the objector, who does not find these results following the business of being a woman, it is only necessary to say that there are business failures everywhere, but a business is not judged by its failures but by its successes.

Girlhood of Queen Victoria (The). Edited by Viscount Esher. In 2 vols. Longmans, Green & Co., New York. $9.

This is even more interesting as a reflex of the English life and the Court surroundings than were Queen Victoria's letters, published some five years ago. The book consists of a selection from Queen Victoria's diary between the years 1832 and 1840—that is, from her thirteenth to her twentieth year. The first page of the original diary bears the entry, "This book Mamma gave me that I might write the journal of my journey to Wales in it." Naturally, from the period covered by these diaries, Lord Melbourne plays an extremely prominent part in the story, and the narrative of the way in which he taught the royal little girl what were the duties of a queen and what were the important things in English political life is interesting and often really charming. The book is of interest also in its unconscious revelation of Victoria's growth in intelligence and judgment. It is a pleasant and agreeable as well as an ingenious record. One could wish that it had been published in less imposing and expensive form.

Among My Books. By Frederic Harrison. The Macmillan Company, New York. $1.75, net.

Frederic Harrison, the venerable English jurist and historian, in this volume of sympathetic comment, trenchant criticism, and illuminating essays, has again placed the world of serious readers in his debt. The book takes its name from those chapters wherein, with his own library for text, he gossips happily on the art and the makers of literature. "Gossip" is hardly the word, unless it be modified by the adjective "Olympian." Earnest student and careful scholar that Mr. Harrison is, he is never in any sense pedantic. As he himself says, "the first thing and the last thing in a real book is thought. Tons of research will not weigh down an ounce of mind. For the canonization of dead facts is the ruin of healthy and pleasant reading. And if reading gives no enduring pleasure, it serves no enduring purpose." Nothing could better describe the spirit in which this book is written. The second part of the volume is devoted to more various matters. Mr. Harrison's address on "Chatham and the Colonies" and his reminiscences of Charles Eliot Norton should be of particular interest to American readers. His discussion of Rodin is one of the most valuable and suggestive commentaries on the tendencies of modern art that we remember reading. The poetic clarity of his vision is as refreshing as a summer rain. The same ability to measure modern activities at their proper worth is shown in his brief chapter on the coronation at Westminster. There are few writers with the sanity and balance of Frederic Harrison.

American Mediterranean (The). By Stephen Bonsal. Moffat, Yard & Co., New York. $3.

The opening of the Panama Canal may bring with it the American Government's "moral protectorate" over all the lands bordering on the Caribbean Sea, though this "protectorate" will probably have nothing to do with political boundaries. Be this as it may, the construction of the Canal has certainly given to us special interest in all the countries bordering on what Mr. Bonsal calls "the American Mediterranean," and his just-published book on them is therefore particularly timely. It deals with their history, any foreign occupation or ownership, their relation to this country, the possibilities of developing our trade with them, and especially the responsibilities which we owe to them. The book is also useful for reference, not only because of its text, but also because its appendix includes certain state papers and statistics.

Dickens's Originals. By Edward Pugh. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. $2.50.

All lovers of Dickens will enjoy this book. So will those who are interested in seeing how a great novelist gets material for his work. It has long been believed that many of Dickens's character sketches had a historical basis. Mr. Pugh traces this historical basis. He truly says that Dickens "paints not individuals, but types."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His characters are not portraits, but they are types suggested by real men and women, and Mr. Pugh gives us some account of these real men and women and their connections with the author's creations. For example, in Chapter IV he shows the connection of Samuel Weller with Sam Vale, Sergeant Buzfuz with Sergeant Bompos, Justice Stareleigh with Justice Gazalee, Mrs. Leo Hunter with Miss Monckton, and Mr. Pott with Lord Brougham.

Reminiscences of a Diplomatist's Wife. By Mrs. Hugh Fraser. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York. $3.

Mrs. Fraser's books of reminiscences have been widely read. Her first book on Japan was extremely entertaining—and valuable, too, as a study of the country and its development. Her second book dealt with experiences in the many countries where she followed her husband in his movements as a diplomat of recognized ability. This third book deals largely with Italy, but touches on Poland and many other places. Like its predecessors, it is full of incident and personal experience and affords pleasurable reading throughout.

Miscellany of Men (A). By Gilbert K. Chesterton. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. $1.50.

The publishers of Mr. Chesterton's latest collection of fugitive papers quote with appreciation some one's remark that "Chesterton may end his days in a madhouse, but never in an old ladies' home." There is certainly virility of thinking as well as cleverness of expression in this volume. Not the least interesting thing in the book is the author's preface, which has some of the paradoxical phrases to which we are accustomed, but which is clear and straight in its thought.

Cities of Lombardy (The). By Edward Hutton. The Macmillan Company, New York. $2.

Mr. Edward Hutton has written a number of books about Italy; but he could hardly write too many. Emotionally æsthetic as he is, his text is not, as might be expected, redundant and full of "vain repetitions;" for example, this:

> Monte Generoso should be visited for its own sake. For it possesses all kinds of scenery, a country of trees and hedges and meadows at its base, forests of chestnut trees, and, higher, of wild laburnums laden and weighted down with gold, and about the summit the bare and barren rock of the mountains. And everywhere there are flowers, deep beds of lilies-of-the-valley, columbines and white asphodels, golden hawkweeds and the too sweet narcissus, a dazzling brightness beyond which crimson peonies gleam amid the rocks, while in the higher places gentians and ranunculuses blow in the thin and eager air. Indeed, in the early heat there is no more pleasant place in Europe than this dry and lonely mountain which thrusts itself beyond its fellows so steeply into the Lombard plain.

Plays: Creditors—Pariah. By August Strindberg. Translated by Edwin Björkman. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 75 cents.

The name of the Swedish writer August Strindberg is still practically unknown in America. But, as half a dozen of his plays are now translated, we shall learn to know him better. The latest to appear are "Creditors" and "Pariah." Of the first Mr. Björkman, the translator, thinks that "its rarely excelled unity of construction, its tremendous dramatic tension, and its wonderful psychological analysis combine to make it a masterpiece." "Creditors" and "Pariah" are notable because of the exceptional types of women presented, and have been adversely criticised on this account. In reply, the translator says:

> It must be remembered, however, that, in spite of his avowed realism, Strindberg did not draw his men and women in the spirit generally designated as impressionistic; that is, with the idea that they might step straight from his pages into life, and there win recognition as human beings of familiar aspect. His realism is always mixed with idealism; his figures are always "doctored," so to speak. And they have been thus treated in order to enable their creator to drive home the particular truth he is just then concerned with. . . . There are many ways of presenting truth. Strindberg's is only one of them.

This is all very well. But how about the morality values? The less said the better, one may think at first as he reads particular passages with disgust and repulsion. In dealing with questionable phases of life, Ibsen, also an idealist, would doubtless have been more artistic. Yet perhaps the Norwegian would not have brought out more forcibly than does the Swede the awfulness of the abnormal.

Reef (The). By Edith Wharton. D. Appleton & Co., New York. $1.30.

This novel has all of Mrs. Wharton's fineness of literary workmanship, but the social problem it turns around is not particularly pleasant in itself, and the character studies, although subtly rendered, are not strong or really worth while. The scene of the story is in France, although the principal characters are Americans.

Forest Farm (The). By Peter Rosegger. A. C. Fifield, London.

Even in translation this volume of "Tales from the Austrian Tyrol" is as fresh and sweet as the smell of plowed land after a spring rain. Peter Rosegger is more than the national poet of Styria. He is a writer who speaks for all men who have faith in the earth as the one mother of things worth while. Peter Rosegger is more, too, than a witness to the inherent beauty and sincerity of peasant life. He is a living refutation of those who profess to believe that poetry, as a healthy and normal means of expression, has passed from existence.

Fortunes of the Landrays (The). By Vaughan Kester. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis. $1.35.

This posthumous novel by the author of "The Prodigal Judge" is on the whole a worthy successor to that book, although it does not quite reach the depths of intense human interest which certain portions of the first story attain. The novel is very long, and in some parts would be better for condensation. It is essentially the study of the growth of a small Ohio town in its relations to the rest of the world, and particularly to the great industrial advance of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country and the movement toward the Far West. That part of the story which deals with the adventures of a party of young men who start to reach California in the time of the gold fever, and are destroyed by treachery and villainy, is distinctly thrilling and exciting, and is extremely well done. The story might almost end here; but it is carried on, rather too slowly, and is occupied with the life and love of a group of young characters, one or two of the most interesting of whom take part in the Civil War.

Problem of Edwin Drood (The). By Sir W. Robertson Nicoll. The G. H. Doran Company, New York. $1.25.

There seems to be a fascination to many minds in the attempt to work out consistently the puzzling plot which Charles Dickens left unfinished. Dr. Nicoll, as we used to call him, or Sir Robertson, as we presume we should now call him, is ingenious in his theory, and also makes an attempt in a broad way, as his subtitle promises, to present not merely a plot study, but a study into the essential methods of the great novelist.

Valiants of Virginia (The). By Hallie Erminie Rives. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis. $1.25.

This story of Southern life is notable for its really captivating pen pictures of scenes in a little Virginia country town long after the war. In this place linger many of the old customs and social traditions which elsewhere have passed away. The rendering of the Negro dialect is exceedingly good—and this is not so common as many people may suppose. At times, and especially in the earlier part, the book is highflown and super-romantic; but in the main it is entertaining and cheerful.

Behind the Dark Pines. By Martha Young. D. Appleton & Co., New York. $1.50.

These are stories for children supposed to be told by an old Southern "mammy," who always began with "Behime de dark pines, chillen, behime de dark pines." The Rabbit, the Mocking-bird, Preacher Crow, Miss Bat, and the Snake Doctor are foremost characters in these tales. The author is a past expert in Negro dialect, and a good story-teller besides.

Soddy (The). By Sarah Comstock. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. $1.30.

This little story has a claim on the attention, not as a piece of finely wrought literature, but because it tells with realism and homely vividness of pioneer hardships and courage in the Western country. "Terry," the young girl who sticks to her "soddy" (possibly some of our readers may not know that a soddy is a house built of sod cut from the prairie), is a heroine in her faith, her devotion to her brother and sister, and her devotion also to the idea of conquering the opposition of nature and of making a home. This task, left to her by her father, she accomplishes with cheerfulness and girlish joyousness, and with a determination superior to that of most men. Of course there is also an enthusiastic young man pioneer, and the love story is true and simple.

Cyclopedia of Education (A). Edited by Paul Monroe, Ph.D. Vol. III. The Macmillan Company, New York. $5.

It is rare to find in a work devoted to the exhibition of modern knowledge in any branch of science—its history, progress, theory, and practice—an article whose delineation of a vanished type of savage life glows with the sympathy transmitted with its blood to its civilized and cultured descendant. The article in this volume by Dr. Charles A. Eastman, of Amherst, Massachusetts, a pure-blooded descendant of the once powerful Sioux, on "The Native Training of American Indians," possesses that unique interest, and is sufficient authority for the statement that their ideals of life were "surprisingly high" to correct the prevalent contrary impression. Such justice to the victims of a century of dishonor is in its way as serviceable to sound knowledge as the other contents of this invaluable work of reference are in lines more immediately practical. How many and diverse are these lines appears at a glance: *e.g.*, Household Arts in Education and Learned Societies; Heating of School Buildings and Educational Work of Insurance Companies; Journals and Journalism and Juvenile Delinquency; Games and Idealism; Harvard University and the George Junior Republic. The methods as well as the history of teaching in this and other countries are given with due criticism of defects, as in the article on Geography. A mine of minute information, historical, descriptive, statistical, is in the many pages given to Germany, Italy, and Japan. Many biographical articles with portraits commemorate great educators in this and other lands. It would be difficult to name a place from Iceland to India, or a subject from indeterminate equations to latrines, if it be related to education, that has escaped due notice. Thus thoroughly has this work covered "the general circle of education"—the literal meaning of encyclopædia. It is enriched with fourteen full-page illustrations.

Roger of Sicily and the Normans in Lower Italy, 1016-1154. By Edmund Curtis, M.A. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. $1.50.

The history of Sicily is certainly many-sided. The country has been ruled by Greeks and Romans, by Saracens and Normans, by Spaniards and Italians. Among its rulers one finds many an interesting and inspiring name. One of the most striking is that of Roger II. In 1045 Robert Guiscard, the Norman, arrived in lower Italy, and so great was his military prowess that the Pope some years later had to make him Duke of Apulia and Calabria. A generation of fighting finally gave Sicily to Roger,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert's brother. Roger became Count of Sicily, and thus the formal dominion in the Mediterranean was solidly established. With this first Count of Sicily, says Mr. Curtis, there appeared a spirit in politics new to the Middle Ages. For Roger, first among mediæval princes, gave full play to the varying creeds, races, and languages. Latins, Moslems, and Greeks were equally tolerated. Such was the background for young Roger II, who was to become the crowned Count of Sicily. By his mother he was half Italian. Not a great warrior, as were his father and uncle, his was the courage of the council chamber, and he became a very notable monarch. He died in 1154, at the height of his power. The traveler of to-day finds a reminder of him in the most exquisite sight in Palermo, the Cappella Palatina in the royal palace at Palermo. It is, as Mr. Curtis says, "the most gorgeous of all Western churches, a gem of color and lightness, the highest product of that diverse and cosmopolitan civilization over which Roger presided." In the "Wars of the Nations" series there are many extremely interesting and suggestive volumes, but Mr. Curtis's account of Roger II will, we think, rank with any of them.

Religious Liberty. By Francesco Ruffini. Translated by J. Parker Heyes. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. $3.50.

In this monumental work of historical research an Italian scholar traces from its rise in ancient times through its development in modern times to its triumph in the nineteenth century the progress of religious liberty as "an idea and principle essentially juridical." He has done this as it has till now been never so adequately done. The story of the long struggle is followed through all states and all churches in large detail, and with ample recognition of its chief prophets and promoters. To Faustus Socinus, the organizer of Unitarianism in the sixteenth century, is awarded the merit "of having determined, more or less immediately, all the subsequent revolutions in favor of religious liberty." Americans flatter themselves that the American separation of Church and State has produced a larger religious liberty than has been given where the State has exercised authority in ecclesiastical affairs. On the contrary—to cite the most telling case adduced—Professor Ruffini shows that by our laws "the iron, absolutist hierarchy of the Catholic Church is recognized and protected in such a manner . . . that, in the alleged régime of full religious liberty and of common law, the laity, in the administration of its societies, has power infinitely inferior" to what it enjoys in Prussia, and even in Italy. Judging from the fullness and general accuracy of the chapter devoted to the progress of religious liberty in this country, the rest, relating to European countries, may be accepted as equally careful and thorough. Some slips there are. The Mayflower Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth in December, not in September. The reformer Zwingli was not "hostile to every form of persecution;" he persecuted the Anabaptists in Zurich. Viewing religious liberty as incomplete while individual citizens are at all disadvantaged by their religious opinions, Signor Ruffini doubts whether it has yet been achieved anywhere. Whether it fares better under State patronage, as in England, or apart from the State, as here, is a question which he discusses at length with remarkable impartiality.

Americans in Panama (The). By William R. Scott. The Statler Publishing Company, New York. $1.35.

Most of Mr. Scott's book is taken up with a first-hand and lively description of the Panama Canal. As to his qualifications for the work he says:

> In the five months the author spent in Panama, he was for slightly more than three months an employee of the Isthmian Canal Commission, living the routine life of a Canal employee. He discovered that, had he followed the usual method of coming into the Canal Zone on one steamer, taking notes, and leaving on the next steamer, he would have missed many fundamental facts, which absolutely must be known if a really trustworthy account of the greatest task of the age is desired.

The volume is distinctly interesting on the historical side. In a book entitled "The Americans in Panama" we do not look for much account of the discovery of Panama by Bastides (1501), or Columbus's exploration of the Panama coast in 1502, or Balboa's discovery of the Pacific in 1513, or of Panama's revolt from Spain in 1821. But we do look—and we are not disappointed—for a compact account of the events from 1850 with which we are connected. In that year the construction of the Panama Railroad was begun. Particularly interesting is this account of the relations between Panama and Colombia:

> Panama's relations with the parent Government . . . had been characterized by intermittent revolutions which never had attained a decisive and final result.
>
> There had been fifty-three revolutions in fifty-seven years. . . . But any advantages so gained by Panama had been lost by voluntary or involuntary resumption of subordinate relations to Colombia, with the net result going to prove that Panama, unassisted, never could hope to achieve independence from the mother country.
>
> The United States, on many occasions, had intervened in these quarrels between Panama and Colombia, frequently on the invitation of Colombia. . . .
>
> These interventions were based on our treaty with Colombia, ratified in 1846. As noted before, this treaty provided for the joint sovereignty of Colombia and the United States over any canal that might be built in Panama, and further guaranteed the neutrality of the Panama Railroad. . . .
>
> Colombia, in 1902, appealed to the United States, under its treaty, to maintain the neutrality of the Panama Railroad during the most important revolution that Panama ever had attempted, and the military intervention by the United States in that year largely enabled Colombia to crush the revolution. . . .
>
> By maintaining the neutrality of the railroad, through the use of marines, the United States kept the line open, and so enabled Colombia to get its troops across the Isthmus to strike down the revolutionists. Had not the United States thus assisted Colombia, it is doubtful if she could have retained sovereignty over Panama with-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out the exertion of considerably stronger forces than were employed.

Colombia had promised, in consideration of the intervention of 1902, a treaty to the United States for a right of way for a canal in Panama. Weeks before this treaty was killed—on August 12, 1903—a few leading business and professional men in Panama saw the drift.

Then follows a detailed account of the "drift," in which Mr. Scott expresses his opinion that the American Government made the Panaman revolution successful. He concludes, as to the future of Panama:

Many confidently expect the United States to abolish the government there sooner or later, because it is clear that the republic cannot stand clear of American support. On three occasions already the Americans have prevented the disruption of the republic. In 1904 General Huertas, who had assisted the Junta, became dissatisfied with his rewards, and started to overturn the administration by force. The marines had to disarm his small army. In 1908 the United States had to interfere to insure a fair election, and in 1912 this writer saw the Presidential campaign reach a point where the marines and infantry had to be placed at the Panama polls to prevent rioting and fraud.

Foam Flowers. By Stephen Berrien Stanton. Moffat, Yard & Co., New York. $1.

Mr. Stanton's thought and style in this slender but suggestive volume are well reflected in his sonnet "There Was No Room for Them in the Inn:"

"'The world is full; not men, the need, but space!'
So speaks despondency. 'Superfluous stands
Ability with unemployed hands
The day-long idle on the market-place.
Try what you will—'twas better done before;
Look where you may—the seats are occupied:
Crowds lie in wait, and waiting, stand outside
And surge against the fast, debarring door.'
No room for us? Nor was there once for Christ;
Nor ever shall be but for him to whom
The chance to be himself is ample room—
This and this only hath great souls sufficed.
Let but the loyalty to self be strong
And lo, to us both earth and heaven belong."

Here is a quatrain worth quoting:

"Time was, when time was young;
Youth once a draught of fire—
Far now the chalice flung,
Drained of its red desire."

Mr. Stanton's verse is full of feeling, of intimate and exquisite appreciations. Its form and substance somewhat suggest the poetry of Leconte de Lisle and the French Parnassians.

L'Orientation Religieuse de la France Actuelle. By Paul Sabatier. Armand Colin, Paris, France.

Ce qu'on a fait de l'Église. Félix Alcan, Paris, France.

Those who read French and would inform themselves amply and exactly as to religious conditions in France may do so by consulting these recently published volumes. No Roman Catholic, we believe, could describe more truthfully than does M. Sabatier the reasons why France ought to be grateful to a Church which created the sentiments of unity, tradition, and eternity; on the other hand, no modernist could point out more keenly how scientific activity is now increasingly permeating that Roman Catholic communion. As an independent critic, however, M. Sabatier is well within the mark in showing that, after the Franco-German War of 1870–71, the Church was not equal to the task imposed upon her. From that day to ours, with its philosophy of Bergson and Boutroux, the history of the Roman Catholic Church in France has been picturesque, pathetic, and deeply moving. But it has also been suggestive of the better things in the future, which, we believe, await the expression of true religion in France. Despite its regrettably small type, the volume by an anonymous author entitled "Ce qu'on a fait de l'Église" merits attention in connection with the present period of religious and ecclesiastical transformation.

Marken and Its People. By George Wharton Edwards. Moffat, Yard & Co., New York. $2.50.

The traveler in Holland who has not visited the island of Marken should certainly do so. People go to Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and The Hague, and then think that they have seen Holland. They have indeed seen three interesting cities, but they have not seen what is still more interesting—the country. And in order to see the country one goes away from the cities first of all through the suburbs—from Arnhem to Oosterbeek, from Utrecht to Driebergen. But if these suburbs are worth while, the wide country is still more so. Who can ever forget the wonderful road stretching through it from the Rhine at Nijmegen to Venlo? Who can ever forget that other road over the pine-covered hillocks from Utrecht to Ede? But even this is not the real Holland, as Holland is distinguished from other countries. To feel that distinction one must go to the coast and must visit those regions saved by the Dutch from the sea. Above all, one must visit the Zuyder Zee, still in process of reclamation. Of all the points in or about the Zee, no one is more picturesque than the island of Marken. It well deserves a whole volume of description. We are glad that Mr. Edwards, whose book on Holland found deserved welcome, has now brought out a book on this particular part of Holland. In it we find detailed descriptions of the people and their pecular costumes and customs. As might be expected from such an author, his illustrations are especially worth while. For the most part they are, as they should be, sketches in pencil.

New Poems. By Dora Sigerson Shorter. Maunsel & Co., Ltd., Dublin and London.

These "New Poems" of Mrs. Shorter are almost as severely simple in diction as the work of the true balladists. The verse in this slim volume has that freshness and directness of thought which is the surest indication of a genuine poetic power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BY THE WAY

It was an American liner, the Philadelphia, and not the giant Mauretania or Kaiser Wilhelm II, that a couple of weeks ago brought over the biggest Christmas mail on record—8,002 sacks. And the Philadelphia is an old-fashioned boat—so old that she carries a figurehead on her prow, a decoration that is nearly obsolete. But the presents all arrived safely, thank you!

This huge lot of Christmas presents coming from abroad looks as if Christmas giving were more popular in Europe than on this side. Or is the explanation to be found in the fact that America's gifts to the old country frequently take the form of money orders or registered letters, which occupy little space in the mail-bags but count for so much to those who receive them?

In nothing is the genius of great military leaders shown more clearly than in the variety of their expedients for harassing the enemy. Imitating Alexander, Cæsar, and Napoleon in this respect, the generals who direct the attacks of the English suffragettes on modern civilization have lately taken to cutting the wires in public telephone booths! Shall we next hear of their intercepting the baker's boy who delivers the rolls, or taking away nursing-bottles from babies?

Reporters are obliged to write their descriptions of accidents hastily and often from meager data, and in the attempt to make them vivid they sometimes make them ridiculous; for example, a New York City paper a few days ago, in describing a collision between a train and a motor bus, said: "The train, too, was filled with passengers. Their shrieks mingled with the *cries of the dead* and the dying of the bus"!

An English correspondent of the New York "Tribune" says that during the last year the process of making wood pulp into "silk" has been perfected, and that several big firms are now turning out large quantities of the substitute, one of the firms employing 1,000 hands. Absolutely pure silk, says this writer, can no longer be found on the market, and wood pulp makes an almost perfect substitute.

A portrait of George Washington which is supposed by the purchaser to be an authentic picture by Gilbert Stuart was lately sold at auction in London. Four portraits of Washington by Stuart are believed to be in existence, of which three are located; the whereabouts of the fourth has been a mystery. A fine portrait of Benjamin Franklin, by Mason Chamberlain, was also disposed of at the same sale, and brought a much larger price—$14,000—than the somewhat apocryphal Stuart.

The United States navy, according to official reports, last year continued to occupy third rank among the great navies of the world, being outranked only by those of Great Britain and Germany. In the number of battle-ships only Great Britain's navy is superior to ours. The Powers rank thus as to their naval strength: Great Britain, Germany, United States, France, Japan, Russia, Italy, Austria-Hungary.

Sir Thomas Lipton, at a dinner given to him in New York City recently, paid a fine tribute to his American rivals and victors in the international yacht races. "The best sportsmen on God's earth are found in America," he said. "I lost in each race in which I took part because the other was the better boat." Sir Thomas announced his intention of trying for the Cup again in 1914.

A Massachusetts Congressman recently made the discovery that the "shot heard round the world" was really fired at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, instead of at Lexington—on the principle, apparently, that the Portsmouth fight preceded the one at Lexington. By the same reasoning, New York City could claim the honor, through the "battle of Golden Hill." These shots, the Congressman should remember, were heard only locally; it remained for Lexington to become world-famous—like the poet who afterwards celebrated the embattled farmers.

One of the unsolved mysteries has just won space in the newspapers again, after forty years' surcease—that of the disappearance of Charlie Ross, the death of whose mother lately caused the story to be told anew. Charlie was but four years old when he was stolen, and his whereabouts was never discovered. It is said that in recent years many grown-up men, ignorant of their life-history, have believed themselves to be the missing boy; but Charlie probably fills a nameless grave.

The Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, is to be repaired so that the famous crack will not spread any further. An internal structure will be placed in the bell to remove the strain of its dead weight. It is planned to transport the historic bell to the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco.

In 1850 the average farm in the United States consisted of 202.6 acres. In 1910 the average farm numbered only 138.1 acres. This would seem to show that "bonanza farms," vast cattle ranches, etc., are succumbing to the tendency toward intensive cultivation on a smaller scale, and that the movement toward consolidation, so marked in business, has been reversed as far as agriculture is concerned.

The Irish talent for repartee has an amusing illustration in Lord Rossmore's recent book "Things I Can Tell." While acting as magistrate at an Irish village, Lord Rossmore said to an old offender brought before him: "You here again?" "Yes, your honor." "What's brought you here?" "Two policemen, your honor." "Come, come, I know that—drunk again, I suppose?" "Yes, your honor, both of them."

Edward Sheldon, the playwright, in a recent interview says that his first idea of a play comes to him as a whole, complete. He does not catch a hint of a story from the newspapers and then elaborate it mechanically by rules, but "proceeds from a center outward, from a completed entity that is vague and confused to a completed entity that is clear and consistent."

Los Angeles has a woman policeman. Her duties are to guide and protect women, particularly strangers, and to oversee dance halls, skating rinks, picture shows, and other places attended by young girls who are ignorant of the dangers of city life and who can be warned or helped by a sensible woman who is alive to those dangers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED